DIFFERENCES of the TIME,

IN THREE

DIALOGUES.

The first, anent *EPISCOPACY.*
The second, anent the Obligation of the *COVENANTS* against *EPISCOPACY.*
The third, anent *SEPARATION.*
Intended for the quieting the minds of people, and settling them in more Peace, and Unity.

Psal. 122. 6, 7, 8, 9. *Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls,* &c.

Psal. 133. 1. *Behold how good, and how pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Mark. 3. 24. *If a kingdom be divided against it self, that kingdom cannot stand.*

Heb. 10. 25. *Not forsaking the assembling of our selves together, as the manner of some is.*

Opinionum varietas & opinantium unitas non sunt [illegible]

EDINBURGH, Printed by the He[irs]
of *Andrew Anderson*, Printer to His [illegible]
Sacred *MAJESTY*, *Anno Dom.* [illegible]

READER,

SEPARATION, *which is the Epidemical Diſeaſe of the Time, came to ſuch a height the laſt Summer*, 1678. *that like a Flood, it almoſt carried all before it, in many places of the Land. Theſe* DIALOGUES *were then written. The Author living among a People who were in hazard to be drawen away with the Spait of the Time, thought it his duty to fortifie them againſt the danger, by letting them ſee the ſin, and unwarrantableneſs of theſe dividing Practices, which were now grown to be in faſhion. And this, together with the Activity, and Concurrance of Magiſtrats in the Place, who were careful to ſuppreſs the beginnings of* Schiſm *in the Bud; was found not to be in vain; for through the bleſſing of God that People hath hitherto*

ſtood their ground: for which, they indeed deſerve their commendation: though at firſt, ſundry of them out of Novelty, went to field meetings, yet preſently they returned to the ways of Peace, and Order, a very few excepted. When theſe DIALOGUES *were firſt written, there was no deſign of making them publick, but a Manuſcript coming to the hands of ſome of Note, both for Authority and Learning; It was their Judgement they ſhould ſee the Light; and that through the bleſſing of God, ſome might receive good by them: yet probably they might had lurked, notwithſtanding of this: But now ſeing it's too evident that theſe Schiſmatical Principles, and Practices are not laid aſide, but endeavours made to carry them on vigorouſly as before: It is therefore not only fit, but a matter of conſcience, to diſcover to any who is not unwilling to receive information, how unwarrantable, and ſinful ſuch courſes are; If Scripture, and the Doctrine, even of Presbyterian Divines (not to ſpeak of others) ſhall be impartially conſulted, and admitted to be Judge. It may indeed ſeem ſtrange to ſee,*

not

not only great numbers of the common multitude, but ſundry of better Note, out of zeal to Presbytrie, led away with the humour of Separation, *and drinking in the principles of the* Brouniſts: *Notwithſtanding, theſe ills have been zealouſly teſtified againſt, and diſputed down, even by Non-conformiſts, and Presbyterians of former, and later times. Only the third* DIALOGUE, *which is anent* Separation, *was at firſt intended: But ſeing people make* Epiſcopacy, *and the* Covenant *the great grounds of their Separating. It was conceived, that to ſpeak of* Separation *alone, would not be enough, unleſs ſomething were firſt ſpoken of the other two, to ſhew what a ſandy ground* Separation *is built upon; Eſpecially if* Epiſcopacy *ſhall be found in it ſelf lawful, at leaſt, and the* Covenant *in every caſe not obligatory. In ſpeaking to* Epiſcopacy, *not only is the meer lawfulneſs of that Government aſſerted (a thing not queſtioned by any of the Ancients, ex-*

Zanchius (ſpeaking of *Epiſcopacy*) Obſerv. in ſuam ipſius confeſſionem, Cap. 25. Aphoriſ. 10. & 11. ſides,

mea nititur cum primis & simpliciter verbo Dei. Deinde non nihil etiam communi totius veteris Catholicæ Ecclesiæ consensu, si ille cum sacris literis non pugnet. credo enim quæ a piis patribus in nomine Domini congregatis, communi omnium consensu citra ullam Scripturæ contradictionem, definita & recepta fuerunt: Ea etiam (quanquam haud ejusdem, cum sacris literis, authoritatis) a Sp. Sancto esse. Hinc fit, ut quæ sunt hujusmodi, ea ego improbare, nec velim nec audeam bona conscientia. Quid autem certius ex Historiis, ex Conciliis, & ex omnium Patrum scriptis,

cept Aerius, *and rarely by any of the Modern, even such who think it was not the primitive Government left by the Apostles, if we except some of our Divines in* Britain, *who betake themselves to* Aerius, *and go a greater length in opposing of* Episcopacy, *than* Jerom *can be reasonably thought to have done, and whom* Blondel Præfat. ad Apolog. pag. 59. *vindicats from Arianism*) *but also some of these proofs are set down which may, and use to be adduced,*

to

to shew that it is the only Government that hath best warrant in the Word, and was continued in the Church downward from the Apostles, for many years without interruption. If the unlearned Reader find the first DIALOGUE *too high for his Capacity (though for his help, care is taken to translate the Latine Testimonies into English) he may pass unto the other two, especially to the third anent* Separation, *which he will find more plain, and easie to be understood*

quam illos Ministrorum ordines, de quibus diximus, communi totius Reipub. Christianæ consensu, in Ecclesia constitutos receptosq; fuisse? Quis ego sim, qui quod tota Ecclesia approbavit, improbem? *Blondel as in other places of his* Apolog. *So particularly*, pag. 193. *roundly approves of* Episcopacy. *Ut (saith he)* ἐπισκοπὴ per se considerata ad Ecclesiarum Regimen absolute, ἐπισκοπὴ annexa πρεσβυτερίῳ ad Regiminis modum & ὑπαξίαν pertinet; quam suo semper arbitrio permissam, sæculorum omnium credidit Ecclesia —— nec opus est quicquid Humana Christum profitentium consuetudo in

divinorum usu ausa est, nefas putare —— suasq; in rebus hujusmodi Christianæ prudentiæ partes obire licere in confesso sit, nec ulla nunc Ecclesia in exemplum trahi potest, quæ ex generali hoc præcepto 1 Cor. 14. 40. quæcunq; & decentiora, & commodiora sequendi, plenam sibi potestatem factam, non censeat.

derstood: And in it all the reasons which are brought for the Separation of the time (in so far as the Author could learn) fairly propounded, and answered without passion, or provoking expressions, which do no good, but are apt to gender more strife, and alienation of minds and affection. These Conferences are now suffered to go abroad out of real commiseration towards well meaning but misled people? Here is brought some Water to quench those fierce and unnatural Flames, which threaten to burn this poor Church to ashes. In the Preface before the Corpus and Symtagma of the Protestant confessions, Edit. Genev. The Church of Scotland hath this great commendation; Est Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ privilegium rarum præ multis, quod

sine

ſine Schiſmate, nedum Hæreſi, unitatem cum puritate Doctrinæ retinuerit. *i.e. The Church of* Scotland *hath this rare priviledge above many others; That (ſince the Reformation) they have without Hereſie, or ſo much as* Schiſm, *retained Unity, with purity of Doctrine. O but how have we now loſt our good Name! How is the Staff, BANDS, broken in the midſt of us*, Zech. 11. 14. *The Author could have wiſhed a work of this nature had been undertaken by ſome able hand, or at leaſt this had been in a better dreſs, but now, Reader, you have it ſuch as it is, and if thou be one concerned, be intreated to lay aſide prejudice: Conſider what a woful thing diviſion in a Church is, and what the fearful conſequences may be*; A kingdom divided againſt it ſelf cannot ſtand, ſaith *Chriſt*, Mark 3. 24. If we bite and devour one another, take heed we be not conſumed one of another, *ſaith* Paul, Galat. 5. 15. Diſſolution is the daughter of diviſion, *ſaith another*; Omne diviſibile eſt corruptibile, *ſaith the Philoſopher*. Divide & impera, *ſaith the Politician*. Si collidimur, frangimur, *ſaid the two earthen Pots in the Fable that were*

ſwim-

swiming down the Stream together. These expressions tend to shew the bad consequences of division. We have lately received a loud warning from Papists to unite: Rome *knows how to fish in our troubled Waters. The Lord convince us of the necessity of Union, and teach us to keep the* unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; *and discover to many what smal evidence they give of friendship to the Protestant Interest, by keeping up divisions.*

The Reader is desired to correct these following Errors with his pen before he readeth, at least to read them right as they are here marked.

ERRATA.

P.	L.	For	Read.
17	17	Evangelist	Evangelists
23	16	Polycrats	Polycrates
23	20	either	Usher
39	24	Ministrum Christi	Ministrum
39	25	Christs Minister	a Servant
55	10	declared	decreed
57	15	and no change	and the change
57	16	but the vestige	but no vestige
74	9	[illegible]	me
85	11	Putat	putant
94	11	pag. 26.	pag. 52.
94	15	sayeth he,	sayeth he, pag. 39.
99	21	Author	Authors
104	15	protestanti	protestantes
133	19	vers. 12.	vers. 7. 14.
142	11	Rachel	Rachab
150	10	fuerunt	fuerint
155	4	debate	debate
157	16	Opinionem	Opinionum
157	17	Opinlantium	Opinantium
161	8	deney	deny
165	8	Zauchius	Zanchius.
166	21	Chap.	Chap. 7.
167	5	one	an
169	21	became	become
172	1		χειροτονησαντες
172	16	Lut.	Luk.
177	7	useth	use it
186	19	really	real
188	12	are not all	are not at all
189	4	unwarrantably	warrantably
195	8	Lectures	Lectores
195	27	another	other
215	23	favour	servour
216	8	we leave in	we live in.

The Pages 46. 47. are in one anothers place. Also some Sentences wrong pointed, which the Reader may advert to.

THREE

THREE DIALOGUES

Betwixt a Doubting Person and an Informer.

The First anent Episcopacy. The Second anent the Obligation of the Covenants, abjuring Episcopacy. The Third anent Separation.

The first Dialogue anent Episcopacy.

Doub. WHat news Neighbour?

Inf. All the news now are about our growing Confusions and Disorders.

D. *I doubt you can ever expect better under Bishops: I could wish they were taken away.*

I. Why ſo? what ill have they done?

D. *I never heard of any good Biſhops did: I doubt a Biſhop can be a good Man.*

I. Say not ſo, the Hiſtories of the *Church* tell us what ſingular good men *Biſhops* have been, and that hundreds of them have died *Martyres* for the Goſpel under heathen perſecutors: beſides what many excellent men of them ſuffered afterward by *Arrians* and other Hereticks.

D. *I doubt theſe were Lord* Biſhops, *ſuch as ours now are?*

I. If by Lord *Biſhops* you mean ſuch as have a ſuperiority over ordinary Miniſters, it's clear they were Lord *Biſhops* in that ſenſe: but if you mean *Biſhops* Dignified with Titles of Honour by the ſecular powers, I grant they were not Lord *Biſhops*, nor could look for any the leaſt reſpect from the powers of thoſe times, who for the moſt part were enemies, either to *Chriſtianity* altogether, or to the Orthodoxy of it. Yet at the time of the Reformation from *Popery* in *England*, in Queen *Maries* days, we find ſundry Lord *Biſhops* (as you call them) were *Martyres* for the Truth: As

As for Biſhops their acting in civil affairs ſometimes, I will make it none of my buſineſs to debate it with you. Only that it is not altogether incompatible with Eccleſiaſtical Functions, may appear from theſe few things. The Jewiſh *Sanhedrim* (made up of the ſeventy Elders, at firſt appointed to be aſſiſtants to *Moſes* in the civil Government, *Numb.* 11.) did conſiſt partly of Prieſts, which, I ſuppoſe, few verſed in the Jewiſh Learning will deny; ſee *Goodwinus*, his *Moſes* and *Aaron*, lib. 5. Cap. 5. *Junius* on *Numb.* 11. and others. Conſider *Deut.* 17. *v*, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. *Eli* the Prieſt judged *Iſrael* fourty years, 1 *Sam.* 4. 18. and after him *Samuel* the Prophet, (though from his birth lent to the Lord, 1 *Sam.* 1. 28.) went in circuit yearly, judging the people, 1 *Sam.* 7. *v*, 15, 16. And under the New Teſtament, how much Biſhops were imployed in Civil Matters, after Emperours became Chriſtian, you may ſee confeſſed by *Smectimnuus*, Sect. 12. Its true Church-men ſhould be as abſtract from theſe incumbrances, as poſſibly they can; nor are they needleſly, or of choice to entangle themſelves, for

no man, &c. 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. And therefore, ſome ancient Councils have diſcharged them to follow *Military Imployments*, to take *Farms* or the like. And ſome of the Fathers have complained, that themſelves were too much diverted and overcharged with ſecular matters: Yet its hard to ſay that its abſolutely, and in every caſe unlawful for Churchmen to medle in theſe things, for then, it will follow, that a Miniſter may not look after any civil affair that concerns himſelf, and family; and yet whatever Chriſtian neglects this, is worſe then an Infidel, 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. Some of the Fathers were a gainſt Churchmens being Tutors or Curators, yet, I believe, yourſelves do not ſcruple this now adays, nor Countrey Tryſts neither. I need not tell you how much ſome Miniſters in our late times medled in State affairs; *Saravia* at ſome length defends Churchmens actings in theſe matters. But paſſing this, I ſuppoſe you queſtion the lawfulneſs of the Epiſcopal-Office it ſelf.

D. *I do ſo, becauſe I find no command, or expreſs warrand in the Word for it.*

I. That

I. That proves it is not ſimply neceſſary, becauſe not commanded, but proveth not the unlawfulneſs of the Office: Many things may be lawful, yea, and expedient too, which are not commanded, unleſs under ſome General, ſuch as, *That all things be done decently and in order*, or, *to edification*, and ſuch like: That in a meeting of Miniſters, there be a *Moderator* and a *Clerk*, I know you will not ſay is unlawful; yet this is not any where commanded: And many learned men have thought *Epiſcopacy* lawful, though not commanded, or by any Scripture preſident particularly warranted, ſo neither prohibited, but left to the prudence, and choice of Chriſtians, as they ſhall find it expedient, and conducing to the good and peace of the Church.

D. *I think it is forbidden in the Word, and therefore unlawful.*

I. Let me hear in what Scripture?

D. *In* Mat. 20. ver. 25, 26, 27, 28. *Where Chriſt forbiddeth any of his Diſciples to be greater than another.*

I. If you think all ſuperiority among Church-men there forbidden, you are in

a miſtake: for, 1. Chriſt there ſpeaks to the twelve, among whom I can grant there was to be no inequality, in reſpect of power, yet they were ſuperior to the ſeventy *Diſciples*, whom Chriſt alſo ſent to preach the Goſpel, as Divines commonly think; and appears from *Act.* 1. Where *Matthias* one of the ſeventy, as *Clemens Alexandrin*: *Dorotheus*, and others affirm him to have been; is ſolemnly choſen and advanced to the Office of Apoſtleſhip, in the room of *Judas*; and he was numbred with the eleven Apoſtles, *verſ.* 26. 2. The thing *Chriſt* there diſcharges, is Ambition, and not Inequality, otherwiſe the Argument he taketh from his own example, *verſ.* 28. would not ſuit his purpoſe: For without controverſie *Chriſt* was in Power and authority above the twelve. But take the words as ſpoken againſt ambition, or a ſinful deſire of ſuperiority (which afterward was *Diotrephes* his fault) the reaſon from his own example ſuits well; for though in power he was above all, yet in humility he was a pattern to all. Humility and Imparity can well conſiſt together.

D. Chriſt

D. *Christ there says*, The Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion; but it shall not be so among you: *Therefore it seems he discharges all superiority among* Church-men.

I. He only discharges that kind of dominion, which civil Princes exercise, which is *dominium civile & despoticum*; a civil, princely, or Lordly power: but the power of the Church is of another nature. And besides, sundry Interpreters think that Christ there speaketh against the Tyrranny, which heathen Princes of the world exercised over their miserable Vassals and Subjects. You may consult Mr. *Pool*'s Collection of Interpreters on the place.

D. The Apostle, 1 *Pet.* 5. 3. *says*, Be not Lords over Gods Heritage, *Is not superiority among* Church-men *there clearly forbidden?*

I. Not at all: only Domineering and Tyranny is there forbidden, which may be the fault of an ordinary Minister towards his flock. The Apostle is not there speaking of the carriage of Church-men towards Church-men, nor of the equality, or inequality of them among themselves:

ſelves : but of Church-mens behaviour and carriage, what it ought to be towards the people, who are there called *the flock, and Gods heritage.*

D. *In the New Teſtament,* Biſhop *and* Elder *are two words ſignifying one and the ſame Officebearer: for* Act. 20. *theſe who in* verſ. 17. *are called* Elders, verſ. 28. *are called* Biſhops; *alſo*, Tit. 1. verſ. 5. *and* 7. *compared together. So that Biſhop and Elder are the ſame in Scripture: And the word* Elder, *ſignifies no more, but a Miniſter of a particular Congregation.*

I. I grant theſe two words are ofttimes in the New Teſtament uſed indifferently to expreſs one and the ſame *Officer*; yet it will not be granted, nor can ye ever prove, that the *Officer* meant by theſe words, is never to be underſtood of any above the degree of an ordinary Miniſter, or that the word *Presbyter*, or *Elder* ſignifies only a Miniſter of a ſingle Congregation, and no more. For, 1. We find the name, *Elder*, given to the Apoſtles themſelves, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. *Joh.* Epiſt. 2. 1. and Epiſt. 3. 1. And if the Apoſtles be called Elders, Why may not Biſhops be called ſo too? 2. Your ſelves ſay, that

that the word, *Elder*, ſignifies not only the Preaching Elder or Miniſter, but alſo the Ruling Elder; I can upon as good, and better ground, ſay, It ſignifies the Biſhop and the Miniſter, both being Elders, but of different degrees: and conſonant to this in ſome after ages, we find thoſe who were unqueſtionably Biſhops, yet ſometimes deſigned by the name of *Presbyter*, that is, *Elder*, Thus we find *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, called *Presbyter*, and *Irœneus* Biſhop of *Lyons*, called *Presbyter Eccleſiæ Lugdunenſis*: Though ordinarly at that time, ſuch were called *Biſhops*; yet ſome times they are called *Presbyters*, as ſtill remembring the firſt times of the New Teſtament, when the name was indifferently given to Biſhops and Miniſters.

D. *The Apoſtle*, Philip. 1. 1. *Speaketh of* Biſhops *in the plural number in that Church, who were only Miniſters, ſince there could not be many Biſhops over Miniſters in that one Church of* Philippi.

I. Ambroſe, a Father of the Church, thinks the *Biſhops* in that place not to

be underſtood of Biſhops at *Philippi*, but of certain Biſhops who were preſent with *Paul* when he wrot that Epiſtle, and in whoſe name he writes to the *Philippians*, joyning them with himſelf. Others think there might be ſundry Biſhops of the Churches about conveened at that time, at *Philippi*, and *Paul* knowing of this, might write to, and ſalute them together with that Church: For ye ſee, he firſt names all the Saints at *Philippi*, as thoſe to whom he mainly intended to write, and then the Biſhops and Deacons. But granting by theſe Biſhops and Deacons, the Officers of that ſame Church of *Philippi*, to be meant; I ask you where are the Ruling Elders here? If you ſay they are included in the word, *Biſhops*, I can upon better ground affirm, that *Biſhops*, there ſignifies both the ſuperior Biſhop, and the ordinary Miniſters under him. Miniſters may be called *Biſhops*, even as in that ſame Epiſtle, *Epaphroditus* is called *Apoſtle*, *Chap.* 2. *verſ.* 25. For the word in the Greek is Apoſtle; But further, I ſay, may be, there was no Biſhop over Presbyters ſettled as yet at *Philippi*.

D. *In*

D. In Eph. 4. 11. *The Apoſtle reckoning up Church-Officers, makes no mention of* Biſhops.

I. It is ill reaſoning, that becauſe ſuch an Officer is not found, in ſuch a particular place, or in ſuch an enumeration; Therefore ſuch an Officer is no where to be found in Scripture; For how prove you that the Apoſtle in that place intended a full and compleat enumeration. 2. I ſay *Biſhops* in that place may be comprehended under *Paſtors* and *Teachers*, *Biſhops* being ſuch, though in a ſuperior degree to ordinary Paſtors, and Teachers. And if you will have a perfect enumeration of all Church-Officers there, you muſt comprehend *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons*, under ſome of thoſe words in that place, and why may not I do ſo with *Biſhops*?

D. *Well, though may be, there is no diſcharge of* Epiſcopacy, *ſo I ſuppoſe, neither is there any ground in the word for that kind of Government, more then any other, and thus the beſt you can make of it will be, that it is not unlawful, ſo neither neceſſary; and therefore when it comes*

comes to be inexpedient, it may be altered, and a better put in its place.

I. If ye will promiſe not to ſtand out againſt Light, I ſhall endeavour to let you ſee warrant from the word for *Biſhops.*

D. *I am not ſo ſettled in my perſwaſion againſt* Biſhops, *as to ſtand out againſt light, that is offered to me from the Word (for this were a great fault in me, or in any man elſe) yet I believe it will be hard for you to let me ſee any convincing* Scripture *Evidence for them.*

I. Under the Old Teſtament, ſetting aſide the *High-prieſt*, who was a Type of Chriſt there was a ſubordination among the reſt of the *Prieſts*, mention is often made of the *Chief-prieſts*, 2 *King.* 19. 2. *Ezra.* 8. 29. *Mat.* 2. 4. *Act.* 19. 14. and over theſe again, there was a *Chief*, or *High-prieſt*, under the *Higheſt* of all, who only was Typical; hence ſometimes two *High-prieſts* are mentioned, *Luk.* 3. 2. So there was a ſubordination among the *Levits*, *Ex.* 6. 25. *Num.* 3. *verſ.* 18, 19. compared with *verſ.* 24, 30, 32, 35. and in other places, *Neh.* 11. We find one over the

Levits

Levites verſ. 22. named *Epiſcopus* by the Greek, and another over the *Prieſts*, *verſ.* 14. So you ſee ſubordination among Church-men, is no ſuch new, nor odious thing as ſome would make the world believe.

D. *I ſee indeed there was a ſubordination under the Old Teſtament, but that proves not that there ought to be the like under the New?*

I. I know no reaſon why the Lord would have a ſubordination under the Old Teſtament, but to maintain Order and Unity in his Church, and this reaſon is ſtill the ſame, for a ſubordination under the New; yea, is now ſtronger, becauſe the Chriſtian Church is of much greater extent than the Jewiſh was, and ſo the danger of diviſions and ſchiſms, and the neceſſity of preventing them, greater. And what better way for this, than Gods own way, which he preſcribed under the Old Teſtament, whereby the ſame way and courſe is examplarly pointed out to Chriſtians, although the New Teſtament gave no other ground for the like. What better pattern for modelling

of

of Church Government can we now have, than his own pattern, who knows beſt what is moſt behoveful for his Church? and this you ſee was a ſubordination under the Old Teſtament.

D. *Yet I deſire to hear what warrand you can produce for* Biſhops *out of the New Teſtament?*

I. Firſt I produce to you the ſuperiority of the twelve Apoſtles above the ſeventy two Diſciples, as is granted by Divines generally.

D. *That was extraordinary, perſonal and temporary, and to expire with the* Apoſtles.

I. Indeed in ſome things the Apoſtles were extraordinary, and their priviledges to ceaſe with themſelves, ſuch as their immediat calling, their ſending to all Nations, their Infallibility, Gifts of Tongues, or whatever elſe was neceſſary for the firſt founding of the Chriſtian Church. But in ſome other things, wherein they were ſuperiour to other Miniſters; their power was not extraordinary and temporary; but was neceſſary, and ſtill to be continued in

the

the Church after they were gone, ſuch as Ordination of Miniſters, and governing of them by Eccleſiaſtical Authority: Thoſe things which were thus neceſſary, they tranſmitted to others after them, even to the Biſhops, ſays *Auguſtin*, on *Pſal.* 45. 16. *In ſtead of thy fathers ſhall be thy children*; By the *Fathers*, he underſtands the *Apoſtles*; by the *Children*, the *Biſhops*, who followed after the Apoſtles, *Hodie enim*, ſaith he, *Epiſcopi qui ſunt per totum mundum, unde nati ſunt?* that is, the Biſhops who are this day over the whole World, Whence are they born? and addeth, that *the Church calleth the Apoſtles Fathers, and did bear the Biſhops as Sons, and placed them in the room of the Fathers.* In the next place, I produce to you *Timothy* and *Titus*, both Biſhops, the one at *Epheſus*, the other at *Crete.*

D. *All the Miniſters who were at* Epheſus *and* Crete, *were* Biſhops *too, for ſo* Paul *names them in theſe Epiſtles.*

I. Its true Paul names Miniſters, not only *Presbyters* but alſo *Biſhops*; yet I ſay

ſay, *Timothy* and *Titus* were Biſhops in that ſenſe, that the word ἐπίσκοπος or *Biſhop*, was afterward ordinarly taken in, that is, they had a power in Ordination and Juriſdiction over and above inferior Miniſters. Our debate is not about the *Name*, but about the *Office*.

D. *That* Timothy *and* Titus *had a power in thoſe matters over other Miniſters at* Epheſus *and* Crete, I *grant, for they are taught by the Apoſtle how to ordain Miniſters, what qualifications to require in them, how to proceed in their tryal and cenſures, &c. But this power they had as* Evangeliſts, *that is, they were companions to the* Apoſtles *in their labours and travels, and appointed by them to ſettle and water thoſe Churches they had planted.*

I. Then it ſeems you would unbiſhop *Timothy* and *Titus*, and make them extraordinary Officers, whoſe Office was not to continue in the Church.

D. I *think ſo,* Paul, 2 Tim. 4. 5. *wiſheth* Timothy *to do the work of an Evangeliſt, therefore* I *think he was an* Evangeliſt *and no* Biſhop.

I. In-

I. Indeed he was an *Evangeliſt* in a large ſenſe, that is, one who preached the Evangel, or Goſpel; but that he was an *Evangeliſt* in the ſtrict ſenſe, can no more be proved from that Scripture, than that he was a *Deacon*, becauſe the Apoſtle in that ſame place, ſaith, *Fulfil thy deaconſhip*, ſo the Greek word ſignifieth, we have it tranſlated, *Miniſtry*, or that *Philip* was an extraordinary Evangeliſt, becauſe he is called an *Evangeliſt*, *Act.* 21. 8. For he was a *Deacon*, *Act.* 6. And vve read, *Act.* 8. 5. that upon the diſperſion he alſo preached the Goſpel; but find no ground, that therefore he was one of thoſe extraordinary Evangeliſt, whoſe Office was to ceaſe in the Church: and beſides, Ordination, and Juriſdiction, is properly no work of an *Evangeliſt*, but rather preaching and ſpreading the Goſpel.

D. Philip *might be both a* Deacon, *and an* Evangeliſt.

I. If you will have him ſo, why might not *Timothy* and *Titus* as well be both Evangeliſts and Biſhops, if you will needs have them Evangeliſts in your ſenſe, e-

ven

ven as *Jerom*, *in Epiſtola ad* Euagrium, and *de ſcriptoribus eccleſiaſticis*, maketh *Mark* the Evangeliſt, *Biſhop* of *Alexandria.*

D. Biſhops *they could not be*, *becauſe we find them very unſetled*, *eſpecially* Timothy; *had he been Biſhop of* Epheſus, *he had been confined to his charge*; *but* 1 Tim. 1. 3. *He was left there only for a ſeaſon*, *and upon an occaſional buſineſs.*

I. *Timothy* and *Titus* were rare and ſingular perſons, and uſeful to the Apoſtle in thoſe firſt beginnings of the Goſpel; and ſo no wonder though the Apoſtle ſeeth fit now and then to call them from their particular charge, when the good of the whole Church required it, *Phil.* 2. 19, 20. 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. Hath it not been uſual in any time, and have we not ſeen it practiſed in our own time, that a Biſhop or Miniſter be called away from his ſettled charge for a ſeaſon, when the good of the Church requires their ſervice elſewhere, and to return when that ſervice is over, *Gerhard Locor. Theologic. Tomo ſexto*, *pag.* 358. Thinketh that *Timothy* and *Titus* were

were firſt Evangeliſts, and afterwards ſettled Biſhops by *Paul*, the one at *Epheſus* the other at *Crete*.

D. Paul Act. 20. 27. *Gives a charge to the Elders or Miniſters of* Epheſus *and not to* Timothy, *which he would not have omitted, had* Timothy *been their* Biſhop; *and it is very probable that* Timothy *was preſent at that time, for* verſ. 4. *we find him in* Pauls *company.*

I. May be, according to *Gerards* opinion *Timothy* was not as yet ſettled Biſhop of *Epheſus*. 2. *Iræneus* who lived not long after the Apoſtles, and vvas Biſhop of *Lions* in *France*, *lib.* 3. *cont. Valentin. cap.* 14. is of the mind, that there vvere of the *Aſian Biſhops* mingled vvith the Elders of *Epheſus*, and vvith *Timothy* their Biſhop, and that to them all in common *Paul* made that exhortation; and Biſhops might very vvell be comprehended under the name of *Elders* in that place, ſince I ſhevv you before that *Apoſtles* are ſometimes called *Elders*.

D. *How prove you that* Timothy *and* Titus *were* Biſhops, *for* I *have great doubt about it?*

I. I prove it *firſt* from this, becauſe in theſe Epiſtles more particularly and fully then any vvhere elſe in the Nevv Teſta. directions are given by *Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, how to carry in *Ordination* and *Juriſdiction*, which two comprehend the Epiſcopal Office. He ſheweth them what qualifications they muſt require in thoſe that are to be ordained, *that they lay hands ſuddenly on no man*, and giveth them ſundry directions anent Church Government, how to rebuke offenders, *no to receive an accuſation againſt an* Elder, *but before two or three witneſſes*, how to deal with *Heretícks*, *&c.* 1 *Tim.* 5. 1, 19, 21. *Tit.* 3. 10. and 1. *v.* 5, 10, 11. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22, 17. alſo *ch.* 3. 10. And in other places of theſe Epiſtles. Now theſe are directions which concern not that Age only, but all Ages of the Church; and therefore were given, not perſonally to *Timothy* and *Titus*, but in them to their Succeſſors. Why I pray you, will any have *Timothy* and *Titus* to be extraordinary Officers in their acting of theſe things, which they cannot deny are of ordinary uſe in the Church. What wonder

der (as the King in his laſt reply at the Iſle of *Wight* hints) that ſome have affirmed thoſe Acts of Ordination and Juriſdiction, vvere in themſelves extraordinary, for ye have led them the vvay, in ſaying that *Timothy* and *Titus*, in their exerciſing thoſe Acts, vvere extraordinary Officers. Then I prove it from this, becauſe their commiſſion at *Epheſus* and *Crete*, vvas not voided upon the firſt ſettling of Miniſters in thoſe places: and therefore their Office vvas to be conſtant. For, if meerly as *Evangeliſts* they vvere to ſettle a Church there, then as ſoon as ſome fevv Miniſters had been ordained, *Timothy* and *Titus* vvere to ceaſe, and give vvay to the *Presbytrie* there ſettled, *fruſtra fit per plura*, &c. but they did not ſo, nor did their Commiſſion run ſo; *Titus* vvas left in *Crete*, *to ordain Elders in every City*, *Tit.* 1. 5. that is, *Miniſters*, vvhich had been needleſs, if ſome fevv Elders after they vvere ordained themſelves, might have ordained others. *Jus divinum Miniſterii Evangelici*, *pag.* 185. Defending Ordination by Church-men, againſt ſuch as claimed that povver to

the

the people, says, *Why was* Titus *left in* Crete, *to ordain Elders in every City*: *or* Timothy *at* Ephesus, *might not the people have done that themselves, if they have a right to do so?* May not the Argument be turned against the Authors of that Book themselves; thus, Why was *Timothy* left at *Ephesus*, or *Titus* at *Crete*, after Ministers were there ordained by the Apostle himself, when on the place, or after some few were ordained by *Timothy* and *Titus*, if those Ministers so ordained, could have ordained the rest. 3. I prove it from 1 *Tim.* 6. 13, 14. Where *Paul* solemnly charges *Timothy to keep what he had commanded him till the appearing of Jesus Christ*; Now the Presbyterians in their *Jus divinum Ministerij*, *pag.* 74. say, that the directions given to *Timothy*, were not for that age only, but for all ages of the Church, and bring this place to prove it, which is like *Mat.* 28. 20. *I am with you always even unto the end of the world*, and they compare the foresaid charge, with 1 *Tim.* 5. *ver.* 7, 21. Whence it would follow, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not extraordinary Offi-

Officers, but were to have ſucceſſors in thoſe Offices they then adminiſtrated; which we ſee were ſuperiour to ordinary Miniſters, and *pag.* 160. they ſay, *Apoſtolical examples in things neceſſary for the good of the Church, and which carry a perpetual reaſon and equity in them, have the force of a rule*: Now the Apoſtle, his ſetting *Timothy* and *Titus* ſingle perſons over thoſe Churches, is an Apoſtolical example done for the good of the Church, and hath a perpetual reaſon and equity in it. Laſtly, I could prove this by the Teſtimony of many great men in the Church, both Ancient and Modern: *Polycrats*, born within fourty years after *John* wrot his Epiſtle to the Church of *Epheſus*, *Rev.* 2. In an ancient Treatiſe, *de Martyrio Timothei* (as it is cited by *either* in his *original of Epiſcopacy*, *pag.* 58.) affirms, that *Timothy* was Biſhop of that Church. *Euſebius lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. affirms the like. *Leontius* Biſhop of *Magneſia*, in the general council of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 11. declareth, that from *Timothy* there had been a continued Succeſſion of twenty ſeven Biſhops in the Church of *Epheſus*. *Jerom*, *de ſcriptoribus*

bus Eccleſiaſticis, makes *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and *Titus* of *Crete*. *Euſebius lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. doth the like. *Abraham Scultetus*, on *Titus* affirmeth, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were properly *Biſhops* in their ſeveral places; and that the directions given by *Paul* to them in theſe Epiſtles, were given to them, and to their Succeſſors. *Gerhard*, *Tom.* 6. maketh them both Biſhops, as I told you before, I might produce moe Teſtimonies, but theſe may ſuffice.

D. *Albeit you ſay much to make* Timothy *and* Titus *Biſhops, yet* Paul *ſayeth that* Timothy *was ordained by the* Preſbytrie, 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Therefore I think he could not be their* Biſhop: *for a Presbytrie, which is but a company of* Miniſters, *cannot make a biſhop.*

I. Some, among whom *Calvin*, think that by *Presbytery*, the Apoſtle meaneth not a *company of* Miniſters, but the *Office* of a Miniſter, or Preſbyter. But ſuppone the company of Preſbyters be meant yet theſe might be, not the inferior degree of Preſbyters, or Miniſters, but the Superior degree, who are biſhops: and that *biſhops* be called *presbyters*, ought

ought not to ſeem ſtrange, ſince I told you the Apoſtles themſelves are ſometimes called *Presbyters*. 3. 2 Tim. 1. 6. The Apoſtle ſayeth, *Timothy* was ordained by the laying on of his hands, ſo that what was ſubſtantial in that Ordination, as Interpreters of *good note*, think, was from *Paul*; although the Preſbytry of Miniſters, if you will, might ſhare in the ceremonial part of it. 4. If you ſay *Timothy* an *Evangeliſt*, was ordained by inferior Elders, you muſt confeſs that ordinary and inferior Officers, might ordain a Superior extraordinary Officer, which is abſurd.

D. *Have you any proof more for biſhops out of the* New Teſtament?

I. The *Angels* of the ſeven Churches, *Rev. chap.* 2. and 3. were Biſhops, for it is undenyable there were many Miniſters, for example, at *Epheſus*, *Act.* 20. 27, 28. Yet *Revel.* 2. When that Church is written to, which was long after *Pauls* exhortation, *Act.* 20. and the Church was on the growing hand; yet, I ſay, we find but one *Angel* among all theſe Miniſters, and he alone ſpo-

ken to, and commended for what was praiſe-worthy in that Church, and blam'd for what was faulty, as he who had the chief hand in that Churches affairs: So may be ſaid of the reſt; the Epiſtle always directed to the Angel, and he commended for what was right and diſcommended for what was wrong; ſeing by his place and authority, he ought to have ſeen to the preventing, or reforming of thoſe things.

D. *The word*, Angel, Rev. 2. *and* 3. *denoteth not one ſingle perſon, but is taken collectively for all the Miniſters that were in each of theſe Churches.*

I. I know that is the anſwer uſually given, but have oft wondered at it. No doubt, this Scripture pincheth ſore, when ye flee to ſuch a ſhift; *Sultetus*, a learned Proteſtant, in his obſervations upon *Titus*, hath theſe words, *doctiſſimi quiq; interpretes per ſeptem eccleſiarum angelos intempretantur ſeptem eccleſiarum Epiſcopos, neq; enim aliter poſſunt, vim niſi textui facere velint*, that is; the moſt learned Interpreters, all expound

pound the Angels of the ſeven Churches to be the Biſhops of thoſe Churches, neither can they expound the words otherwiſe; unleſs they offer violence to the text.

D. *But* Rev. 2. 24. *Chriſt by* John *ſpeaks to moe then one, for it is in the plural number* ὑμῖν vobis. *Hence it is clear to me, that by the* Angel *of that Church, he meant all the miniſters.*

I. Will you be content to ſtand to *Beza's* expoſition of the place, he ſays ὑμῖν, is *to you the Preſident, and to the company of miniſters, and to the reſt of the people.* You ſee the word, *Angel*, in his opinion, is ſtill to be taken for a ſingle perſon, and that in this place moe then the Angel are ſpoken unto. This is, as ſome think, an *Apoſtrophe*, which is an ordinary Figure in ſpeech, when the ſpeaker turns his diſcourſe to ſome other than he had at firſt been ſpeaking to; but that which I think ſhould put it out of queſtion, is the Light we have from antiquity, declaring to us that theſe Angels were ſingle perſons, and condeſcending upon ſome of their Names: for I ſuppoſe the practiſe, opinions, and aſſertions of ſuch

as followed hard after theſe Angels, ſhould by any rational man, be acquieſced in, as a ſufficient commentary on this and the like Scriptures, that ſpeak of Church Governours.

D. *Well, What ſay they?*

I. I told you before that *Polycrates* who was Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and born near to the Apoſtles times, ſpeaks of ſeven of his predeceſſors, who had been Biſhops there before him; and *Leontius* Biſhop of *Magneſia*, in the *council of Chalcedon*, ſpeaks of twenty ſeven Biſhops of *Epheſus*, ſucceſſively from *Timothy*: We find the Biſhops of thoſe ſeven Churches of *Aſia*, preſent at the firſt Council of *Nice*, and deſigned by their ſeveral Churches, *Epheſus*, *Smyrna*, *&c.* and ſubſcribing the Acts of the Council with the reſt of the Biſhops. *Jerome*, *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſ.* tells us, that *Polycarp*, who had been *John's* diſciple, was by him made Biſhop of *Smyrna*; ſo *Euſebius*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 32. So *Tertullian præſcrip. cap.* 23. And *Iræneus*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. *contra Valentin.* ſayes, *Polycarp* was by *John* ordained Biſhop of *Smyrna*, and that he ſaw *Polycarp*, when he himſelf

ſelf was a child; for, ſays he, *Polycarp* lived long. Now ſhould not theſe teſtimonies, think you, have weight with any man that's free of prejudice. And further, among *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, who was contemporary with the Apoſtle *John*, we find one written to this *Polycarp*, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, who is thought to be the very ſame Angel to whom *John* writeth, *Rev.* 2.

D. I *think indeed much of theſe teſtimonies, eſpecially of that of* Irenæus, *who, ſays he*, *ſaw* Polycarp, *and ſo knew the Letter that he was a Biſhop: And* I *have heard that* Irenæus *himſelf was a Biſhop too; but for* Ignatius, *his teſtimony*, I *am not much moved with it, becauſe* I *hear ſay, that theſe* Epiſtles *of his are forged and counterfit.*

I. Of theſe *Epiſtles*, we may have occaſion to ſpeak afterward, but if you will be at the pains to ſee, what the moſt part by far, and with all the moſt learned of Proteſtant Writers, and Interpreters, think of theſe Angels; you ſhall find *Beza*, *Diodat*, *Marlorat*, *Bullinger*, *Gualter*, *Piſcator*, *Sibelius*, *Pareus*, *Aretius*, *Fulk*, Our own Countreyman *Napier* of *Marchiſtoun*, *Cartwright*, the learned

ned *Reynolds* in his conference with *Hart*, yea, and *Blondel*, in the preface to his *Apologia pro ſententia Hieronymi*, all expounding the *Angel* in each of theſe Churches, to be a ſingle perſon. So true is it what I told you, *Scultetus* obſerves, *doctiſſimi quiq; interpretes per ſeptem Eccleſiarum Angelos, interpretantur ſeptem Eccleſiarum Epiſcopos.*

D. Beza, *and may be, others of theſe Divines, though they interpret the* Angel *to be a ſingle perſon, yet they never thought that perſon to be a* Biſhop, *but meerly a* Moderator *and* Preſident, *among the reſt of his brethren.*

I. He could be no leſs than *biſhop*, becauſe the Epiſtle is ſtill directed to him, though it's true, the whole Church be concerned in what is written; yet I ſay, the *Angel* is chiefly commended, or diſcommended, according as matters were right, or wrong, which clearly imports that he had the chief hand in buſineſs, and ſo he chiefly capable of what Chriſt by *John* ſays to him: And the power we ſaw before in *Timothy* and *Titus*, above inferiour Miniſters, may oblige us to think, no leſs can be allowed to the An-

gels.

gels. And further, moſt of the Divines I have named do ſay, that theſe Angels were *Epiſcopi*, *Biſhops*. And *Beza* himſelf, *de Miniſt. Grad.* doth in effect, *cap.* 13. give to the Angels an Epiſcopal power, for, he ſaith, *Horum authoritas in Eccleſiæ regimine fuit eminentior*, that is, their authority in governing the Church, was more eminent than the reſt's. I might alſo ſhew you how Mr. *Mede* is miſunderſtood, as if in his *Key of the Revelation*, he did teach, that the word, *Angel*, is commonly through the *Revelation* taken collectively, that is, not to ſignifie one perſon: you may ſee the contrary in his *Key*, *Apocal.* 9. 14. and 14. 6,7. And he ſayeth, the twenty four Elders about the Throne, do repreſent the *Biſhops*, and *Prelats* of the Churches. You may alſo ſee *Brightman*, on *cap.* 7, 8. and ordinarily, through the *Revelation*, he expounds the word, *Angel*, of ſome ſingle perſon. I ſhall produce one place more from the New Teſtament, to prove Epiſcopacy *viz. John* Epiſt. 3. *ver.* 9. *Diotrephes loveth the preeminence.*

D. *I have heard that place brought againſt* Epiſcopacy, *But never for it, till*

now ; *The Apostle there speaks against preeminence.*

I. Not at all: He only speaks against ambitious seeking after preeminence, and finds fault with *Diotrephes*, that he was φιλοπρωτεύων, that is, he did ambitiously love to be first, or to have the chief place. An Office may be good and lawful, and yet an ambitious desire after the Office, sinful. Look what the most judicious Interpreters say on the place: *Beza* renders the Greek word thus, *qui primatum ambit.* Now yourselves confess it was authority over other Ministers, he looked at; and from this ye infer that the Office he aimed at, was unlawful; which will not follow, but rather that there was such an Office then in the Church, and at this time void, unto which he meant to put himself, or had already done so, out of an ambitious desire to be great, which was a sinful end. It was not the good of the Church, but himself he lookt after. *Blondel* confesseth as much in his *Apologia*, *pag.* 54. Saying, that *Diotrephes* would be *Primus Presbyter*, to which place he willingly grants authority over the rest did belong, though

though he will not call him *Biſhop*, yet he grants to him an Epiſcopal power, in effect, *Quis enim* (ſaith he) *præſidentiam ſine authoritate ſomniet, pag.* 39. But of this and the like Conceſſions of his, I may have occaſion to ſpeak to you afterward.

D. *If Biſhops were by the Apoſtles left to rule the Church, as you ſeem to prove from the New Teſtament, why then do we not find them in the Church after the Apoſtles left the world?*

I. We do find them after the Apoſtles left the world.

D. *But not for a long time after the Apoſtles were gone.*

I. You are miſtaken; we find Biſhops immediatly after the Apoſtles, which confirmeth what I have been ſaying for Epiſcopacy from the New Teſtament: For the Biſhops found in the Church immediatly after the Apoſtles, or even before all the Apoſtles were gone, are a good commentary on *Timothy* aud *Titus*, and on the *Angels* of the ſeven Churches, and on the paſſage anent *Diotrephes*.

D. *I would gladly hear what you can ſay*

for Bishops, about, or immediatly after the Apostles times.

I. If you will credit *Jerome*, whom you take for the Patron of your cause, he (*de Scriptor. Eccles.*) speaks of sundry of these first Bishops; of *James* made by the Apostles, the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, whose successor, he saith, on *Galat.* 1. 19. was *Simeon*, *&c. Epaphroditus* Bishop at *Philippi*, and *Mark* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *&c. Eusebius*, *lib.* 3. *Hist. Cap.* 4. *Cap.* 33. *Cap.* 31. 36. *lib.* 4. *Cap.* 14. 25. and in other places is very expres to this purpose. It's known there were in some of the Churches, many Presbyters, or Ministers; yet in these most ancient Records we can read, but of one *Bishop* at a time, and after him another succeeds in his place, and that by a new Ordination; For, *Jerome* says, *Jacobus ab apostolis Episcopus ordinatus est.* Of Episcopal Ordinations, see also, *Euseb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. But passing these, I produce to you *Ignatius*, contemporary with the Apostle *John*, he was Bishop of *Antioch*; and, as is thought, an Arch-bishop, for in his Epistle to the *Romans*, he stiles himself Bishop of the Church in *Syria*, which

is ſuppoſed to have hade moe Epiſcopal Seats in it, than only that of *Antioch*. This *Ignatius* died *martyre* about eight or nine years after the Death of *John*, he wrote Epiſtles to ſundry Churches of that time, in which he frequently ſpeaks of the Biſhops of thoſe Churches, and ſetteth down theſe three degrees of Church-Officers, *viz. Deacons*, *Presbyters*, or *Miniſters*, and *Biſhops*: And exhorts thoſe Primitive Chriſtians to be ſubject to the *Biſhop*, as the only mean to avoid Schiſme, and that without him nothing be done.

D. *I have heard learned men ſay, that theſe Epiſtles are much falſified, ſo that we have them not now, as they were written by* Ignatius: *and therefore any teſtimony taken from them, is the leſs to be valued.*

I. Indeed the Arch-biſhop of *Armagh*, *Uſher*, a man well read in Antiquity, as alſo *Vedelius*, who hath written on thoſe Epiſtles, ſhew, that the Copies of theſe Epiſtles which were uſed, till of late years, are very faulty, which is proved from this, among other things; that many of theſe Quotations, which in the

Fa-

Fathers are found to be cited out of *Ignatius*, are not to be found in those Epistles, as they have been used. But of late years, *Usher* found two very ancient Manuscripts of these Epistles in some Libraries in *England*, and about that same time *Is. Vossius* found a Greek Manuscript of them at *Florence*; All which three Copies agreed together, and differed much from these, that were used before: and in these three were found the Fathers Quotations, which were not found in the old ones: and even in these late found Copies, the Testimonies for *Bishops* are most clear and full. And this so much troubles *Blondel* in the Preface to his *Apologia* that he is forced to seek a new shift, *viz.* that even those Epistles, as we have them in the Copies found by *Usher*, and *Vossius*, are vitiat also: and thinks the Fathers who cite them, were deceived by them: he thinks they have been vitiat, or forged about the year 180. *Salmasius* thinks, *Circiter medium aut initium secundi seculi*, about the middle, or beginning of the second age: Now *Ignatius* lived about the beginning of the second age; and is it pro-

probable they could then be medled with? The reaſons for this forging of them, are alledged by *Blondel*, and anſwered by Doctor *Hammond*. Can it be imagined they ſhould be ſo far vitiat that the very Scope of ſundry of them ſhould be altered, which is to perſwade obedience to the *Biſhop*, as he without whom nothing ought to be done, as they would avoid Schiſm, The Divines who debated with the King, at the Iſle of *Wight*, found themſelves ſo pinched with theſe Epiſtles, that they found no way to eſcape, but utterly to reject them all as counterfeit: Which, the King told them, they did without any regard, either of Ingenuity, or Truth. Sure I am neither *Scultetus*, nor *Rivet*, did preſume to do ſo; for ſeven of theſe Epiſtles they own as written by *Ignatius*; Howbeit, they think ſome corruptions through time, had crept unto them: which corruptions they obſerve: but ſay not, that their mentioning of *Biſhops* as Superiour to *Presbyters*, is one of theſe corruptions. Certainly, had theſe two judicious Divines thought this a corruption crept into

theſe

theſe Epiſtles, they would have obſerved, and mentioned it. You may ſee *Sculteus* in his *Medulla patrum*. And *Rivet* in his *Criticus ſacer*, what their judgement is of theſe Epiſtles. But now of late, Doctor *Pearſon* in *England*, hath largely and fully vindicat *Ignatius*, his Epiſtles; and therefore to him I refer you.

D. *Yet I ſhall be the more cleared in my doubts of theſe* Epiſtles, *if you can produce any other convincing Teſtimonies from Prime Antiquity in favours of* Biſhops.

I. I offer to your conſideration, what *Pius* Biſhop of *Rome*, about the year 146. writing to *Juſtus*, newly elected Biſhop of *Vienna*, in the room of *Verus*, ſayeth, *Veri loco a fratribus conſtitutum & collobio Epiſcoporum* (It's thought this was the Biſhop's Habit, then in uſe) *veſtitum te Presbyteri & Diaconi, non ut majorem, ſed ut Miniſtrum Chriſti obſervent*, That is, Let the Miniſters and Deacons reverence and obey thee, not as one greater, but as the Servant of Chriſt. This paſſage is found in his Epiſtles, in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, *Tom.* 3.

Fol.

Fol. 15. Now by *Presbyters*, in that place, as all along in Antiquity, are meant these, whom we call *Ministers*, which I suppose, will not be denyed; for both the Apostles in their Writings, and all Antiquity that followed, call them so: and yet we see these Presbyters at *Vienna*, had *Justus* a *Bishop* over them, and that *Verus* another Bishop had been there before *Justus*.

D. *It seems* Bishops *were not then acknowledged superiour to* Presbyters, *or* Ministers, *since it's said*, Presbyteri te non ut majorem observent, *that is, let not the Ministers reverence thee, as one greater than they.*

I. By that same reason you should make the *Bishop* no greater then the *Deacons* neither, since it's said also, *Te Diaconi non ut majorem observent*, that is, let not the Deacons reverence thee, as one greater than themselves: Yea, you will make him inferiour to both, for it is added, *Sed ut Ministrum Christi*, that is, as Christs Minister. *Pius* there exhorteth *Justus* to humility, (a very necessar and seasonable counsel for these who are promoted to higher dignity above others)

thers) and therefore biddeth him carry rather like a Servant, then a Superiour; I told you before, that humility and imparity consist well. In the next place, hear what *Hegesippus*, sayeth, who lived in the time of *Hadrian*, the Emperour, before the year 140. a renouned Historian, the ancientest of any that wrot the *Church-history* of the *New Testament*, next to *Luke*, who wrot the *Acts of the Apostles*; *Jerome* (as the *Magdeburgenses*, and *Rivet* report) sayes, *Hegesippus actus omnes a Christi passione ad sua tempora complexus est in sua historia.* He was more ancient than that *Hegesippus*, who wrot *de excidio Hierosolymæ*; nothing of his History is now extant, except a few fragments, cited by *Eusebius*, who, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 21. brings him in giving this account, *Se plurimos Episcopos, cum Romam peregre proficisceretur, convenisse, & eandem apud omnes doctrinam deprehendisse*, That is, when he went to *Rome*, he met with many Bishops, and found they all held the same Doctrine; and a little after he mentions *Primus*, Bishop of *Corinth*, and afterward, *Romæ hæsisse usque ad Anicetum, Aniceto succes-*

sisse

ſiſſe Soterem, iſti Eleutherium: in ſingulis ſucceſſionibus & civitatibus ita habet ſicut lex & dominus prædicant, that is, He ſtayed at *Rome* till the time *Anicetus* was made Biſhop, to whom *Soter* ſucceeded, and to him *Eleutherius*, and that in all the ſucceſſions, and Cities matters were conſtitute, as the Law and the Prophets, and the Lord *Chriſt* did Preach. Then ſpeaking of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, he ſays, after *James*, ſirnamed *Juſtus*, ſuffered Martyrdom, his Uncle *Simeon* was made biſhop, whom all preferred, becauſe he was *Domini Conſobrinus*, a couſin of Chriſts. Further, he ſhews that *Thebulis* turned heretick, becauſe he miſſed a Biſhoprick, *Quoniam non fuit Epiſcopus conſtitutus*, and that till then the Church of *Jeruſalem* was called a *Virgine*, becauſe it had not been corrupted with any falſe Doctrine. From which Teſtimonies of *Hegeſippus*, we may gather, 1. That he ſpeaks of Biſhops in all theſe Churches which he mentions. 2. In every Church he ſpeaks but of one *Biſhop* at a time, to whom, when he is gone, another ſucceedeth: Yet I hope it will not be denyed by you, that

that there were ſundry *Miniſters* or *Preſbyters* in any one of theſe Churches, at one and the ſame time. 3. That the ſucceſſion of Biſhops was by *election*, and not by *Seniority*, as the inſtance of *Simeon*, choſen after *James* at *Jeruſalem*, clears. 4. That ſome were then ambitious of a Biſhoprick, as he reporteth of *Thebulis*, which alſo was *Diotrephes*, his fault. And *Laſtly*, All this ſo ſhortly after the Apoſtles times, that none have any reaſon to doubt of *Hegeſippus*, his certain knowledge what had been the Government of the Church from the Apoſtles times, to his own time, more than we can doubt what hath been the Government of the Church among our ſelves for fourty years bygone: For *Hegeſippus* lived next after the firſt ſucceſſion of the Apoſtles, as *Uſher* in his *Original of Biſhops*, *pag.* 62. gathers out of *Euſebius*.

D: *I would hear what you can ſay more out of prime Antiquity?*

I. I offer to your conſideration what *Dionyſius*, who was Biſhop of *Corinth*, about the year 170. ſays, in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Athens* (*Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.*

cap. 22.) he mentioneth *Quadratus*, their former Biſhop, and *Publius*, Biſhop and Martyre before him, and then *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* their firſt Biſhop, of whom we read, *Act.* 17. Then in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Gortyna*, in *Crete*, together with the reſt of the Churches there, he commends *Philip* their Biſhop; *Uſher* thinks *Philip* was Arch-Biſhop in *Crete*, *Orig. of Biſhops*, *pag.* 73. for *Philip* is called Biſhop, not only of *Gortyna*, but alſo of the reſt of the παροικίας in *Crete*, *Paræcia* ſignified then a whole *Dioceſs*, as can eaſily be made out from antiquity, and we find was afterward alſo Metropolis, and the Biſhop, the Metropolitan of the whole Iſland *Concil. Chalcedon. Act.* 6. *Concil. Conſtantinop. ſub Mena*, *Act.* 5. and 5. *general. Concil.* In which places, the Metropolitan of *Gortyna*, is found ſubſcribing, and this authority of his over whole *Crete*, *Euſebius* deriveth from the times of *Titus*. *Dionyſius* writes alſo to the *Gnoſians*, and exhorteth their Biſhop *Pinetus*, *ne grave ſervandæ caſtitatis onus neceſſario fratribus imponat.* that is, that he would not lay upon his brethren the hea-

heavy burden of an unmarried life. Where by the *brethren*, he muſt mean the *Miniſters* under *Pinetus*, his Juriſdiction: For you can not think, that by the *Brethren*, *Dionyſius* meant *private Chriſtians*: or that *Pinetus*, did preſs private Chriſtians to ſuch a life. It appears then that *Pinetus* was above the reſt of the brethren, that is, of the Miniſters, and that with a power to enjoyn, as is clear from *Dionyſius*, his counſel to him, not to make uſe of his power in that particular. Hear next what *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lions*, ſayeth to this point, he was a Biſhop pious and peaceable, and ſo anſwerable to his name, and lived about the year 180. You need not fear he will deceive you, but may ſay of him as *David* of *Ahimaaz*, *he is a good man, and will bring good tidings.*

D. *Well, let us hear him.*

I. *Irenæus contra Valent. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. ſays, *Habemus annumerare qui ab Apoſtolis uſque ad nos inſtituti ſunt* Epiſcopi *in Eccleſiis, & ſucceſſores eorum, &c.* that is, we can reckon on who have been Biſhops in the ſeveral Churches, and who their ſucceſſors, from the Apoſtles

poſtles even to our own times: and becauſe, he ſayeth it were longſome to go through all, he mentions the ſucceſſion in the Church of *Rome*, until he come down to *Eleutherius*, who was his own Contemporary: And this he doth to prove the falſhood of Hereticks their Doctrine, becauſe not agreeing with the Doctrine of the Biſhops, who, from the Apoſtles downward, had been in the Church. And in that ſame place he ſpeaketh of *Polycarp*, *who*, ſays he, *had converſed with them who ſaw the Lord, and was by the Apoſtles made Biſhop of* Smyrna, and that when himſelf was young, he had ſeen *Polycarp*, for ſaith he, *he lived long.* Now hence we may obſerve, 1. that *Polycarp*, contemporary with the Apoſtles, was even ſuch a Biſhop as *Eleutherius* of *Rome*, who lived in the time of *Irenæus*: for *Irenæus*, makes no difference; and no doubt, *Eleutherius* was ſuch a Biſhop as *Irenæus*, who was Biſhop of *Lions* in *France*, which, I ſuppoſe, few will queſtion. 2. That, as ſome have obſerved, *Polycarp* behoved to be the very ſame Angel of *Smyrna*, who was written to, *Rev.* 2. 8. for, I-

renæus

Why are theſe we contend for, ſingled out and named, and not the other Preſbyters as well as they? Why are the Preſbyters or Miniſters paſſed over in ſilence, and only *Linus*, and *Cletus*, and *Soter*, &c. taken notice of in their ſeveral ſucceſſions, one after another? No doubt, becauſe they were the *Biſhops*, and had an authoritative inſpection above the reſt, as hath been ſhewed already in *Timothy* and *Titus*, and in the ſeven *Angels*, *Revel.* 2. 3. and from the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, and other inſtances. And to ſay they only are named for the more expedit reckoning is *gratis dictum*, and as good as to ſay nothing: and whereas ſome object, that writers differ about the line of ſucceſſion among theſe Primitive Biſhops, therefore it may be doubted there was any ſuch thing as Biſhops, or a ſucceſſion of one Biſhop after another at all: The *King* anſwers at the *Iſle* of *Wight*, this will no more follow, than that becauſe *Chronologers* differ about the line of ancient Kings, in ſuch a Kingdom; therefore there was no Kingly power, nor Kings there at all. 4. Obſerve, that *Irenæus* ſaith, theſe

theſe

renæus ſaith, *Polycarp was ordained Biſhop of* Smyrna *by the Apoſtles themſelves*, who all lived before *John*, and he ſurviving the reſt, wrot at Chriſts command, theſe Epiſtles to the ſeven Angels, ſo that *Polycarp* muſt be that *Angel* of *Smyrna* to whom *John* wrot; for *Polycarp* lived till *Iræneus*, his time, who ſays, when himſelf was a child he ſaw this old Biſhop, for ſays he, *Polycarp lived long, and continued in* Smyrna *until his laſt, and died a martyre.* Uſher *in his Orig. of Biſhops, pag.* 60. reckons his martyrdome to have been ſeventy four years after *Johns* writing that Epiſtle to him: and that he continued Biſhop there until his death, is collected from *Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. 3. We ſee clearly, though there were in the Church of *Rome* many *Presbyters* or *Miniſters*; yet without taking notice of them; *Irenæneus* only names one at a time, who was more eminent than the reſt, and after he is gone, nameth another, who ſucceeded him: Now if all comes only to this, that theſe whom he nameth, had no more but the ſame authority and ſucceſſion with the reſt of the Preſbyters;

Why

these ancient Bishops *succeeded one another by Apostolical institution, Qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt*, saith he, *usq; ad nos Episcopi.* 5. This *Valentinus*, against whom *Irenæus* writes, was a *Presbyter*, and turned *Heretick*, because he came short of a Bishoprick, *Tertul. adversus Valent. cap.* 4. See also *Irenæus*, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 43, 44. and to add a word of *Irenæus* himself, he was Bishop of *Lions* in *France*, τῶν κατὰ γαλλίαν παροικιῶν ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει, *Euseb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 23. But after the Latine, 21. *Parœciarum per Galliam quas* Irenæus *moderatus est.* Hence it is clear he was their Bishop, or Arch-bishop, as some think, for, παροικία then signified as much, as a Dioceſs now; See *Can. Apost. Can.* 14. *Concil. Antioch.* 9. 14. *Concil. Ancyr. Cap.* 13, 18.

D. Against what you speak of Irenæus *calling him a* Bishop, *and an* Arch-bishop, I *have this to say, that the* Gallican *Church in their letter to* Eleutherius, *calls* Irenæus *Presbyter, and so doth* Eusebius, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4.

I. *Peter* calleth himself a *Presbyter*, or *Elder*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. And yet we know he was more. *Irenæus* himself in his writings, calls *Bishops Presbyters*: *Victor* who

who ſucceeded to *Eleutherius* in *Rome*, is called *Presbyter*. *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. and yet without all contradiction he was a *Biſhop*, , and a great one too, when he would have extended his Juriſdiction, not only over his own, but over the *Aſian* Churches alſo, *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 21, 23, 25. *Salmaſius* in his *Walo Meſſalinus*, freely confeſſeth, *pag.* 265. *Romani Pontifices vocantur Presbyteri etiam poſtquam Epiſcopatus apicem ſupra presbyteros conſequuti ſunt ſinguli in toto orbe Epiſcopi.* But hardly will you find the name of *Biſhop* any where in thoſe times given to a ſingle *Presbyter*.

D. *What more can you ſay for* Biſhops *out of the ancient Fathers?*

I. I could produce you Teſtimonies from *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, who was contemporary with *Irenæus*: but ſomething of him I ſpoke before, and from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and other Fathers, who lived in the ſecond age. And from *Tertullian*, about the year of Chriſt two hundred, who ſhews, *de preſcript. cap.* 36. That the Apoſtolical Chairs at *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, were poſſeſt; not by a *Presbytrie*, but

by ſingle perſons. Alſo, *cap.* 11. and *de baptiſmo*, *cap.* 7. *Dandi Baptiſmum jus habet ſummus ſacerdos qui eſt* Epiſcopus, *Dehinc* Presbyteri *&* Diaconi, *non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter honorem Eccleſiæ quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt, &c.* That is, the Biſhop hath the power of giving baptiſm; then the Preſbyters and Deacons, yet not without the Biſhops authority, *&c.* I might produce much more from thoſe firſt times, in favours of Biſhops. *Euſebius* the ancienteſt Church *hiſtorian*, now extant, all along maketh it his work to ſet down the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in the Churches of theſe firſt times, *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. from the Apoſtles downward unto his own time; in every of which Churches, none that hath any skill can deny, that there were ſundry Preſbyters, or Miniſters at the ſame time; and yet without noticing theſe, he ſets down the line of Biſhops, one after another, in theſe ſeveral Churches. And for the time that followed after *Tertullian*, it's undenyable by you all, there were Biſhops in the Church, and the Fathers who followed, were not only moſt of them

them Biſhops themſelves, but looked upon Epiſcopacy as deſcending unto them from the Apoſtles, as can be made out from their Writings.

D. *You know* Jerome, *who lived toward the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth Century*, ſaith, *Epiſcapocy was not from the beginning in the Chriſtian Church*, Epiſt. ad Euag. *which is the* 85. Manifeſtiſſime comprabatur eundem eſſe Epiſcopum & Preſbyterum quod autem poſtea unus electus eſt qui cæteris præponeretur, in ſchiſmatis remedium factum eſt, ne unuſquiſq; ad ſe trahens Chriſti Eccleſiam, rumperet. *That is, It's moſt manifeſt that Biſhop and Presbyter are the ſame, and that afterward one was choſen and ſet over the reſt, it was done in remedy of Schiſm*, &c.

I. Jerom's meaning is, that in the very firſt beginnings of the New Teſtament times, it was ſo, while the Apoſtles were yet alive, and did by their own preſence and induſtrie ſupplie the room of *Biſhops*, but as their preſence began to fail by death, or even ſooner, as their other great buſineſs called them elſewhere, upon the dayly increaſe and enlargement of the Church, then to prevent

Schism, that arose from equality, there were *Bishops* set over *Presbyters*. And that *Jerome* must be understood speaking so early of the Church, appeareth from what immediatly followeth in that same Epistle, *Nam*, sayes he, *& Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelistâ usq; ad Heraclium & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum & in excelsiori gradu collocatum*, Episcopum *nominabant*, *quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi Archidiaconum*, That is, at *Alexandria*, from *Mark* the Evangelist downward to *Heraclius* and *Dionysius* Bishops, the Presbyters alwise elected one from among themselves, whom they placed in a higher degree, and called him Bishop, even as an Army would chuse a General, or Deacons an Archdeacon. Now *Mark* is reckoned to have died before either *Peter* or *Paul*; and even from him downward, *Jerome* saith, there were Bishops in that Church. It is strange to see how warily and defectively *Smectimnuus* cites these words of *Jerome*, quite beside *Jerom's* intent, to prove that Bishops were not from the beginning, and to show how they were brought in by *Presbyters*;

Which

Which if *Smectimnuus* mean to have been in the Apoſtles ovvn times, we agree that ſo it was, but becauſe they (for *Smectimnuus* is a Name compoſed of ſundry Authors) would fain have *Jerome* to be meant ſpeaking of Biſhops coming into *Alexandria*, not until the Apoſtles were gone, therefore they leave out his firſt words, *a Marco Evangeliſta*; they take what they think may ſeem to make for them, and leave out what is directly againſt them, which is ſcarce fair dealing: But *Calvine*, *Inſtitut. lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. *num.* 2. citeth this paſſage intirely, and from it concludes that *Jerome* maketh Biſhops ancient enough. Alſo, you may obſerve, how the learned M. *Durham*, on *Revel. pag.* 225. making uſe of this paſſage of *Jerome*, that you do, to prove that Biſhops were of later date than the Apoſtles; Yet he mentioneth not *Jerom's* words, *Alexandria a Marco*, &c. in which, *Jerome* clearly makes the Original of Biſhops in that Church, as high as *Mark*; which paſſage, either deſtroyeth the gloſs you would put upon *Jerom's* former words, if in them you think the Father ſpeaks of bringing in Biſhops into the

Church, not till after the Apoſtles times, as Mr. *Durham* ſaith expreſly, or elſe you would make *Jerome* contradict himſelf. 2. Mr. *Durham*, as he takes no notice of the Succeſſion of Biſhops at *Alexandria*, from *Mark* downward; ſo neither of the firſt Simile which *Jerome* makes uſe of, *viz.* *Quomodo ſi exercitus imperatorem faciat*: But only of the ſecond Simile of Deacons, making an Arch-deacon, *for helping them*, ſaith he, *in what belongeth to the orderly management of their buſineſs, which ſhews what kind of Precedency this is he attributeth to the Biſhop, even ſuch as he would allow to a Deacon, who is advanced to ſome Peculiar Care by others, for ſome ſpecial end.* Thus Mr. *Durham*, as he is very loath to bring in *Biſhops* till after the Apoſtles times, ſo after they are brought in, he would have their power, as inſignificant as may be; but taketh no notice of *Jerome*, his comparing the *Biſhop* to an *Emperour*, or *General* of an Army, who hath, not only a Precedency, but without all controverſie, a Superiority of power and command.

D. Jerome *on* Tit. 1. *is very expreſs that*

Bi-

Biſhop *and* Preſbyter *are the ſame*, Idem eſt ergo, *Presbyter*, qui & *Epiſcopus*, & antequam diaboli inſtinctu Studia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, Ego ſum *Pauli*, ego *Apollo*, ego autem *Cephæ*, communi Preſbyterorum conſilio Eccleſiæ gubernabantur: Poſtquam vero unuſquiſq; eos quos baptizaverat, ſuos putabat eſſe in toto orbe decretum eſt, ut unus de Preſbyteris electus, ſuperponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertineret, & Schiſmatum ſemina tollerentur. That is, *Presbyter and Biſhop are the ſame, and before through Satans inſtigation there were diviſions, and ſome ſaid, I am of* Paul, *I of* Apollo, *and I of* Cephas, *The Churches were governed by Presbyters in common: but afterward when every one thought thoſe to be his, whom he had baptized; it was declared through the whole world, that one ſhould be ſet above the reſt, and on him all the care of the Church devolved, and the ſeeds of Schiſms rooted out:*

I. Some think *Jerome* in that place ſpeaketh of the power, Biſhops in his time had come to, beyond what the firſt Biſhops had, That at the firſt, Preſbyters

had a hand in Government, but afterward, *Omnis Ecclesiæ cura ad unum pertinebat*, The whole care of the Church was put over upon the Bishop alone. But if you think *Jerome* there speaks of the first Introduction of Bishops unto the Church, then I say, he must be meant speaking of the Apostles own times.

D. *What reason have you to think so?*

I. First, because *Jerom's* words import this, while he says, that the thing which gave occasion to the introducing of *Bishops* was the divisions that arose among Christians, and some said *I am of* Paul, *I of* Apollo, *&c.* And then *Presbyters began to think these to be theirs whom they had baptized*: Now thus we read it was among the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 1. And though *Jerome* on *Tit.* 1. take occasion from the Community of Name, that the Apostle there uses, while he calls the *Presbyter*, *Bishop*, *ver.* 5. and 7. compared together, to shew, that at first there were no Bishops above Presbyters: yet this will not necessarily infer that there was no distinction of Office betwixt *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, when the Apostle wrot to *Titus*, or that *Jerome* thought there was

was no such distinction then: But that as the names were then promiscuously used by the Apostle, so sometimes there was no distinction of the Offices, till necessity introduced it, which change *Jerome* takes occasion to speak of from the community of Name still used by the Apostle even after the change was made. *Secondly*, because that decree which *Jerome* says was made over all the world for introducing Bishops; had it been after the Apostles times, we should have some account of it in antiquity, about what year, after what manner, in what Council, &c. that Decree was made, and no change that followed upon it: but the vestige of this is to be found. *Thirdly*, The supposing such an universal change of Government after the Apostles were gone, will infer, that shortly after the Apostles there was an universal defection in all the Christian world from that Government, which ye think the Apostles left as unalterable in the Church: which is very hard to imagine. What! Not one honest man in all the world, that we hear of, to open his mouth and oppose this innovation, but without contradiction,

Toto orbe decretum est; how cold will you make the zeal of those Primitive Christians, to have been in respect of your own now adays. *Fourthly*, because *Jerome* tells us this change was made, *ad tollenda schismata*, And, *in remedium schismatis*, to take away Schism. Now to think, that the Apostles left a Government in the Church, which was liable to this great inconvenience of *Schism*, and that those who came after saw cause to change that Government unto another, for shunning of the foresaid evil; Is too great an Imputation upon the wisdom of the Apostles, and too great a preferring of Posterity before them: But this is salv'd, if we say, that the Apostles themselves, forseeing that parity would breed Schism, did before their departure for preventing of this, set Bishops over Presbyters. *Fifthly*, because this same *Jerome* in sundry places of his writings, derives the Original of *Bishops*, as high as the Apostles, if not higher, *de Scriptor. Eccles.* he says, *Jacobus ab Apostolis statim*, &c. *James* was by the Apostles immediately after Christs Ascension made *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, and that to him succeeded

succeeded *Simon*. And on *Galat.* 1. 19. He says as much of *Titus* at *Crete*, of *Polycarp* at *Smyrna*, of *Epaphroditus* at *Philippi*, and again, *de Scrip. Eccles.* He makes *Mark* the first Bishop of *Alexandria*, and in *Epist. ad Enagrium*, says, *Ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento*, *Quod* Aaron *& filij ejus &* Levitæ, *in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi* Episcopi *&* Presbyteri *&* Diaconi, *in Ecclesia vendicent.* That is, that we may know the Apostolical Traditions to be taken out of the Old Testament; What *Aaron* and his Sons and the Levites were in the Temple, that Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are in the Church: And *Epist.* 54. *Apud nos Apostolorum locum tenent Episcopi*; With us the Bishops hold the room of the Apostles. And *Epist.* 1. Ad *Heliodorum.* And *dialog. adversus* Luciferianos, and *Epist. ad* Riparium *adversus* Vigilantium, *Miror Sanctum Episcopum, in cujus* Paracia *esse Presbyter dicitur, acquiescere furori ejus & non virga Apostolica confringere vas inutile.* Where you see, he calls the Bishop's power, *Virga Apostolica*, *The Apostolical Rod*, or which was derived from the n-

them. These, and moe Testimonies are brought out of *Jerom's* Writings, to shew that he deduces Episcopacy from the Apostles themselves: So that if you think in some places he cryeth down *Bishops* as an invention later than the Apostles, you shall find that in many moe places, he makes them high enough. And if you will needs have this Father to contradict himself, it will be with advantage to *Bishops*; For, for one word against them he speaks three for them. But if you will save his Credit, you must understand that change he speaks of, to have been in the Apostles own times.

D. *But* Jerome *says*, Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, *That is, Let Bishops know that they are greater then* Presbyters, *rather by custom, then by the truth of the Lords appointment. Which words shew, that Episcopacy came into the Church by custom, not by any divine right.*

I. Some are of opinion that *Jerome* speaks of that authority Bishops were then invested with over Presbyters, beyond what the first Bishops were; this, he saith, they had attained to by custom:

for

for in the ſame Epiſtle he maketh three ſubordinate degrees of Clergy, and that *Ex traditione Apoſtolica*, By Apoſtolical Tradition (which words have much perplexed thoſe of your perſwaſion) So that, if you think *Jerome* by, *Conſuetudo*, meaneth *Cuſtome which came in after the Apoſtles times*, you ſhall make him ſay, and unſay in one and the ſame Epiſtle. But if by, *Conſuetudo*, be meant that *Authority* the Biſhops in his time did exerciſe, beyond what the firſt Biſhops did, no ſuch inconvenience will follow. And that he is ſo to be underſtood appears from this, that in equalling the *Biſhop* as he was at firſt with the *Presbyter*, he ſaith, *Quid facit* Epiſcopus, *quod non facit* Preſbyter, *Excepta Ordinatione*, That is, "What doth the Biſhop, which "the Preſbyter doth not, except *Ordi*-"*nation*: Where you ſee, though he make the Biſhop above the Presbyter as to *Ordination*, yet he ſeemeth to equal them as to *Juriſdiction*. And this ſeems agreeable to what he ſaith, that at firſt, *inter plures Eccleſiæ cura diviſa*, and, *Communi Presbyterorum conſilio gubernatæ Eccleſiæ*, i. e. "Presbyters did at firſt by com-

"mon

"moncounſel govern the Churches, which doth not neceſſarily exclude the firſt Biſhops. And afterward ſpeaking of the power that accreſced in after times to Biſhops, he ſaith, *ad unum omnis Eccleſiæ cura delata eſt*, all the care of the Church was put over upon one. He ſeems to mean, that the Biſhops afterward acted ſolely, to avoid ſchiſm that aroſe from the diſagreeing of many Counſels, thus ſome anſwer that place of *Jerome*. 2. Others, as the learned *Davenant*, think, That by, *dominicæ diſpoſitionis veritas*, *Jerome* meant *Chriſt's expreſs Command*, and by, *Conſuetudo*, *Apoſtolical practice begun by the Apoſtles, and continued by their Succeſſors*. And this is very probable, for this ſame *Jerome*, writing, *ad Marcellum*, about the obſervation of *Lent*, ſaith, it is *apoſtolica traditio*, and *adverſus Luciferianos*, calleth it *Eccleſiæ conſuetudo*, ſo that according to him, what was begun by the Apoſtles may be called *Church cuſtome*, becauſe continued by the Church, So then, this will be *Jerom's* meaning, *Biſhops are greater than Presbyters, not by Chriſt's expreſs Command, but by cuſtome brought into the Church by the Apoſtles and*

continued

continued by their Succeſſors. And now to ſay no more of this Father, whom you take to be the great prop of your Cauſe in antiquity; conſider ſeriouſly theſe few things anent him, 1. Doth not *Jerome* expreſly ſpeak of an Apoſtolical right, at leaſt, that Epiſcopacy hath, and that in very many places of his writings, as I hinted before. 2. Where he ſeems to ſpeak otherwiſe, ſuppoſe he were to be underſtood in your meaning, which is, to make Biſhops of later date than the Apoſtles: Yet doth he not with all ſay, that there was a neceſſity of bringing Biſhops into the Church, that thereby Schiſm might be put out and kept out? And that this was done by a Decree through the whole Chriſtian World. And, 3. Did he not approve of *Epiſcopacy* from it's firſt Inſtitution, down to his own time, as ſtill neceſſary for preſerving Unity and Peace in the Church? and ſubmitteth to it. Now would ye all thus far go along with *Jerome*, our conteſts about Biſhops and their firſt riſe, might ſoon ceaſe. Mr. *Durham* on *Revel. pag.* 227. anſwering the objection, that all antiquity did condemn

Aerius

Aerius, because he took away all distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, answers, that *Aerius* was condemned, not simply as maintaining any thing contrary to truth in this, but as imprudently brangling the order than established in the Church, to the hazard of their Union: Now setting aside the dispute anent the antiquity of Bishops. Have not we in this Land been, and are not you and many others, as chargeable with this imprudence, as ever *Aerius* was: for ye would take away the difference betwixt *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, to the hazarding of Peace and Union, and so brangles that order which under Episcopacy hath been maintained in the Church for many Centuries of years?

D. *You say* Episcopacy *is necessary for preserving the Church in unity and keeping out of* Schism; *but I think not so, or that, ever God did appoint it for this end: for the Holy Ghost would never ordain that for a remedy, which could not reach the end: but became a Stirup for the Pope to get into his Sadle, for if there be a necessity of setting up one Bishop over many Presbyters for preventing Schism, there is the same*

ſame neceſſity of ſetting one Arch-biſhop over many Biſhops, and one Patriarch over many Arch-biſhops, and one Pope over all; unleſs you imagine there is hazard of Schiſm only among Presbyters and not among Biſhops and Arch-biſhops.

I. When you ſay you think not *Epiſcopacy* neceſſary to keep out *Schiſm*, in this you forſake *Jerome* who makes the taking away and preventing of ſchiſm the reaſon of bringing Epiſcopacy into the Church. Alſo you forſake *Calvine* who *Inſtitut. lib. 4. cap. 4. num. 2.* Sayeth, Biſhops were ſet over Preſbyters, *ne ex æqualitate, diſſidia, ut fieri ſolet, orerentur*, that is, leſt diſcords ſhould ariſe from equality, as is uſual to be. As for the ſetting up of Arch-biſhops, and Patriarchs, it is a thing anciently practiſed in the Church, as antiquity ſheweth, and ſomething of this I hinted to you before from *Titus*, and his Succeſſors ſuppoſed to be Arch-biſhops in *Crete*. And from *Ignatius* who calleth himſelf Biſhop of *Syria*, &c. And the firſt Council of *Nice* ſpeaking of Patriarchs, call their Precedency, *Mos antiquus, Can. 6.* This was found to contribute to the Churches Unity;

Unity; and *Calvine* expreſly approves of it, *Inſtitut. lib.* 4. *Cap.* 4. *Sect.* 4. *Quod autem ſingulæ provinciæ unum habebant inter Epiſcopos*, Archiepiſcopum, *quod item in* Nicæna Synodo *conſtituti ſunt* Patriarchæ, *qui eſſent ordine & dignitate* Archiepiſcopis *ſuperiores*, *id ad diſciplinæ conſervationem pertinebat*, i. e. That every Province had an *Arch-biſhop* over Biſhops, and that the Council of *Nice* did approve of *Patriarchs* over Arch-biſhops, was a thing that belonged to the preſervation of Diſcipline. And in that ſame place *Calvin* ſaith, that although he liketh not the word, *Hierarchy*, yet if we look upon the thing it ſelf, ſaith he, that is, Church-government by Biſhops, Archbiſhops and Patriarchs, *Reperiemus veteres* Epiſcopos *non aliam regendi Eccleſiæ formam voluiſſe fingere ab ea, quam dominus verbo ſuo præſcripſit*, i. e. We ſhall find thoſe ancient Biſhops had no thought of feigning any other form of Government from that which the Lord preſcribed in his Word. And further, that for order's ſake there was one *Patriarch* above the reſt of the Patriarchs, with a certain kind of Priority, who was called *Epiſcopus Primæ*

mæ Sedis, *Concil. Carthag. 3. can.* 26. and is a thing granted by Proteſtant Writers. Among others, ſee *Myſterium Iniquitatis* Philippi *Mornæi*, *pag.* 203. 204. &c. and *Bucer*, *inter Scripta Anglicana*, *pag.* 583. and all this was done to maintain order. You ſay *there is no leſs hazard of Schiſm among Biſhops and Archbiſhops*, &c. *than among meer Presbyters.* I deny not but there may be, and have been Schiſms, and claſhings among Biſhops; yet I ſay, it's a Government not ſo liable to this inconvenience as a meer parity is: No Government is ſo exempted, but it may be abuſed by corrupt men; yet one form may be better in it ſelf than another, and more conducing to the ends of Government: Ariſtocratie may be abuſed, yet it hath in it more of the nature of Government than a meer confuſed Democratie. So Epiſcopacy is the beſt Government, although the Pope hath abuſed it. Certainly the beſt and moſt uſeful things in the World may be abuſed through the corruptions of men: are not the Scriptures of God perverted by Hereticks, and muſt the Scriptures

be

be therefore cryed down? Monarchy is oft through the default of men turned into tyrrany, muſt all Monarchy therefore be cryed down? *Bucer de vi & uſu miniſterij, cap. de diſciplina Cleric. inter ſcripta Anglicana, pag.* 583. ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Rome* abuſing his primacy, ſaith, Epiſcopacy muſt not therefore be aboliſhed, *quia*, ſaith he, *omnino neceſſe eſt ut ſinguli clerici ſuos habeant cuſtodes & procuratores, inſtauranda eſt Epiſcoporum authoritas.*

D. *But let us return to the Fathers.* Mr. Durham *on* Revel. pag. 225. ſaith, *not only* Jerom *was of* Aerius *his mind about the equality of* Presbyter *and* Biſhop, *but alſo ſome other Fathers, as* Auguſtine, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, &c.

I. Mr. *Durham* brings this as *Medina's* aſſertion, as he is cited by *Bellarmine*, to which I ſay, 1. Suppoſe theſe Fathers to be of *Jerom's* opinion, no great prejudice will hereby enſue to *Biſhops*, as I have already ſhewed. 2. It's ſtrange Mr. *Durham* ſhould upon any's teſtimony cite *Auguſtine* as being of *Aerius* his judgement anent *Epiſcopacy*, ſince he knew very well that *Auguſtine* directly makes

Aeri-

Aerius herein to be erroneous, and inrolleth him in his Catalogue of *Hereticks*, even for his judgement in this, *Hæreſ* 53. *Dicebat etiam* Preſbyterum *ab* Epiſcopo *nulla differentia debere diſcerni*, i.e. *Aerius* alſo ſaid there ought to be no difference betwixt *Presbyter* and *Biſhop*. 3. *Ambroſe* and *Chryſoſtome* whoſe words are cited by Mr. *Durham*, are miſtaken; for their Teſtimonies will not come up the length intended. *Ambroſe* or one *Hilary* as it's thought, ſaith, *Presbyteri & Epiſcopi una eſt ordinatio, uterq; enim ſacerdos eſt, ſed Epiſcopus primus eſt, ut omnis Epiſcopus Presbyter ſit, non tamen omnis Presbyter Epiſcopus : ille enim* Epiſcopus *eſt qui inter* Preſbyteros *primus eſt*, i. e. both a Preſbyter and a Biſhop is a Prieſt; but the Biſhop is the firſt, ſo that every Biſhop is a Preſbyter, but every Presbyter is not a Biſhop : but he is Biſhop who is firſt among the Presbyters. And *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, That betwixt a Biſhop and a Presbyter there is little difference. Yet both theſe Fathers, you ſee, acknowledge, that a difference there is, and they were both Biſhops themſelves : Their opinion

might

might be that *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* differ *gradu non ordine*, that they might be both one *Order* and differ only in *Degree*; Which is ſtill a debate in the Schools. So may be ſaid of the reſt cited by *Medina* 4. That theſe Fathers were for a difference, even by Divine or Apoſtolick warrant, will appear from other places in their writings.

D. *What*; *For a Divine Right*, Mr. Durham *on* Revel. pag. 225. *ſaith*, *that after diſtinction was made in the Church, betwixt* Biſhop *and* Presbyter, *yet was it never accounted by antiquity to be* jure divino, *by Divine Right.*

I. I ſhew you the contrary from *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others, yea, and from *Jerome* himſelf. Now for thoſe other Fathers, Firſt, hear *Ambroſe* in his Comment. on 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, (*Quoſdam poſuit apoſtolos*) he ſaith, *ipſi ſunt Epiſcopi*, *firmante illud Petro*, *Act.* 1. & Epiſcopatum ejus accipiat alter. And on *verſ.* 29. (Nurquid omnes apoſtoli) *verum eſt*, ſaith he, *quia in eccleſia unus eſt Epiſcopus.* Alſo on *Phil.* 1. 1. Rather then he will allow by, *Biſhops*, in that place ſingle *Presbyters* to be meant, he, ex-

expounds those Bishops not of such as resided at *Philippi*, because, saith he, in one Church there could be but one Bishop: but of Bishops and Deacons who were with *Paul* when he wrot that Epistle, as I told you before. So on 1 *Tim.* 3. *Timotheus Episcopus erat*. And for *Augustine* on *Psalm.* 45. 16. by, *Fathers*, he means the *Apostles*, and by, the *Sons*, the *Bishops*, who, he saith, succeeded to the Apostles. And contra *Cresconium*, *lib.* 2. *Cap.* 37. *Ecclesiam Hierosolymitanam primus* Jacobus *Episcopatu suo rexit*. i. e. *James* was the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*. And, *Epist.* 122. he saith, *divina voce laudatur sub* Angeli *nomine præpositus ecclesiæ*, Speaking of the Angels, *Revel.* 2. 3. and *contra literas Petiliani lib.* 2. *Cap.* 51. *Quid tibi fecit ecclesiæ Romanæ cathedra in qua Petrus sedit, & in qua hodie Anastasius sedet i.e.* What ill hath the Chair of *Rome* (so he calls the Episcopal Authority) done to thee in which Peter once did sit, and in which *Anastasius* now sitteth. From these and the like passages in *Augustine*, we may know what his meaning is, when writing to *Jerome*, he saith, *Quanquam secundum*

hæreti-

honorum vocabula quæ jam eccleſiæ uſus, obtinuit Eſpiſcopatus Presbyterio *major ſit.* there he ſpeaks of the uſe of theſe words, what it was at that time in reſpect of former times. *Honorum vocabula*, clearly ſhews this. Then hear *Chryſoſtome* on 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. (*Cum impoſitione manuum presbyterii*) *Non de* presbyteris *loquitur ſed de* Epiſcopis : *neque enim* presbyteri Epiſcopum Timotheum *ordinabant.* i. e. That place ſpeaketh not of Presbyters, but of Biſhops, for Presbyters did not ordain *Timothy* who was a Biſhop. Sundry Teſtimonies might be produced out of other Fathers, deducing the original of Biſhops from the Apoſtles, or higher. *Cyprian* is full to this purpoſe. *Epiſt.* 27. *ad Lapſos*, , he ſaith, that Epiſcopacy is founded, *divina lege*, by the Divine Law, and *Epiſt.* 68. he calleth it, *Traditio divina & obſervatio Apoſtolica*, and for this adduceth *Act.* 1. 15. *Quando in ordinando in locum Judæ* Epiſcopo, *Petrus ad plebem loquitur.* i. e. *Peter* there ſpeaks to the people of ordaining a Biſhop in the room of *Judas.* See alſo, *Epiſt.* 69. *Epiſt.* 42. and *Epiſt.* 10, 11, 12. &c

D. *What*

D. *What antiquity ſaith, moveth me not; nor reſolve I in this matter to be concluded by Fathers, or Councils, who were fallible; or by Apoſtolical Traditions. There were many corruptions which crept into the Church in the very infancy of it, and were generally received, as the millenary opinion, and giving the communion to Infants.*

I. Yet you can grip very cloſs to the leaſt ſhadow in antiquity, which ſeemeth any way to make for you in this controverſie, and can manage it to your beſt advantage: but when you ſay that you reſolve not to be concluded by antiquity herein: by this you clearly confeſs that antiquity pincheth you ſore; and you are like to be born down by the ſtream of it. *Tertullian* ſaith, *Id verius quod prius, id prius quod ab initio, ab initio id quod ab Apoſtolis, id ab Apoſtolis traditum, quod apud Eccleſias Apoſtolorum fuerat ſacro ſanctum.* As for theſe corruptions you name, which early crept into the Church, they were not ſo generally, and univerſally received, as *Epiſcopacy* was, nor could they ever ſo clearly deduce their Original from the Apoſtles.

D. *Notwithstanding all you say to make Bishops as ancient as the Apostles, yet the authority of those great protestant Divines, who have opposed* Episcopacy, *prevails much with one to suspect Bishops cannot lay claim so high.*

I. Suffer not your judgement to be captivated by the Name or Authority of any man without proof. I fear there be too much implicite faith among us, which we condemn in Papists: and besides, may be, the opposition of the most knowing, and learned Protestants to *Episcopacy*, is not so great as you imagine.

D. *What think you of* Calvin, *is not he much against* Episcopacy *in his Writings? as he was also in his practise, when he lived a Minister at* Geneve *in an evenly parity with the rest of his brethren there, where* Presbyterian parity *as it had been in purest primitive times, was again revived.*

I. Before you take the Government of *Geneve* to be a reviving of primitive *parity*, as you say: It is fit you first solidly answer all I have produced to shew that from the Apostles dounward, there were always Bishops over Ministers, or Presby-

Presbyters even in the pureſt times. I will not inſiſt to ſhew you, that when *Geneve* reformed Religion, ſhe had no purpoſe to put away *Epiſcopacy*, if it could have been preſerved. You may read *Durel's view of Government* from *pag.* 151. to 161. who will inform you in this. Nor will I debate whither *Calvin* lived in an evenly parity with the reſt of his brethren, only hear what *Maſon* apologizing for the Government of *Geneve*, *defence of ordin. pag.* 175. ſpeaking of *Calvin* and *Beza* ſaith, They being choſen to a place of eminency, and endued with *Juriſdiction*, they having preeminence in every action, and conſequently in *Ordination*, none can with reaſon deny them the ſubſtance of the Epiſcopal Office. This he ſpeaketh of them in reſpect of the reſt of the Miniſters at *Geneve*. And B. *Andrews*, *Reſp.* 3. *ad* Molineum, ſpeaking of *Calvin* and *Beza*, ſays, *Quid attinet abolere nomen, retinere rem? Nam illorum uterq; dum vixerunt, quid erant, niſi abolito nomine re ipſa Epiſcopi?* i. e. To what purpoſe is it to aboliſh the name of Biſhop, and retain the thing, for both theſe (*Calvin*

and [illegible]) what were they while living, but indeed Biſhops, though without the name? And was it not ſo even among our ſelves, when the name of *Biſhop* could not be endured? a meer parity is hardly practicable any where, unleſs it be in *Utopia*. Now ſince you think *Calvin*, a great adverſary to Biſhops (a miſtake that many are under) I will produce ſome few places out of him to undeceive you. *Inſtitut. lib.* 4. *Cap.* 4. *Sect.* 2. ſpeaking of the firſt Biſhops, he citeth *Jerom's* words *ad Euagrium*, and then ſubjoyneth, *alibi tamen docet quam antiquum fuerit inſtitutum, dicit enim Alexandriæ a Marco Evangeliſta uſque ad Dionyſium*, &c. i. e. Nevertheleſs in another place, *Jerome* teacheth how ancient the inſtitution of Biſhops is, for he ſayeth, that at *Alexandria* from *Mark* downward, there was ſtill a *Biſhop*, &c. Where you ſee *Calvin* paſſing that place of *Jerome*, that ſeemeth to make againſt the antiquity of Biſhops, he rather layeth hold on that other place that ſpeaketh them as ancient as *Mark* the *Evangeliſt*. And a little before, *Calvin* ſaith, *Biſhops were brought into the Church,*

ne

ne exæqualitate, ut fieri ſolet, diſſidia naſcerentur. Obſerve this, he ſaith, *equality of Miniſters breedeth ſtrifes*, and, *ut fieri ſolet, ſo it uſeth to be.* And from theſe words of *Calvin*, we may collect that he giveth to the firſt Biſhops ſome ſuperiority in power above the Presbyters, without which, ſaith he, *diſſidia naſcerentur*, Strifes would ariſe, and ſo he makes them more than meer *Moderators.* Another paſſage of *Calvin* I cited to you a little before, *Inſtitut. lib. 4. cap. 4. ſect. 4. Si rem omiſſo vocabulo intueamur, reperiemus*, &c. And *Inſtitut. lib. 4. Cap. 5. Sect. 11. Superſunt Epiſcopi & Præciarum rectores, qui utinam de retinendo officio contenderent, libenter illis concederemus eos habere pium & eximium munus*, i. e. Now we are to ſpeak of Biſhops, who I wiſh would contend about the retaining of their Office, we would willingly grant unto them (He is ſpeaking of the popiſh Biſhops) that they have a holy and excellemt Office, if they would rightly diſcharge it. Where you ſee he calleth the Office, *pium & eximium munus*, Holy and excellent. And again a little after, ſhewing how, when it is objected

to the Papists, that their *Regnum*, i. e. Church Government as managed by them, is antichristian tyranny, they answer, it is that venerable Hierarchy, so much and often commended by holy and great men. Which answer of theirs he repells thus, *Sect.* 13. *Quasi vero sancti Patres quum Ecclesiasticam Hierarchiam aut spirituale regimen ut ipsis per manus ab Apostolis traditum erat, commendarent, hoc deforme & vastitatis plenum chaos somniarent, ubi Episcopi vel rudes*, &c. i. e. as if forsooth the holy Fathers when they commend that Ecclesiastical Hierarchy as it was delivered, or handed unto them from the Apostles, did mean it of your deformed Government. Where you see, he saith, that the ancient Episcopacy was delivered down to the Fathers, *per manus ab Apostolis*; from the Apostles hands, or from the Apostles by hand to hand. And on *Titus* 1. 5. He saith, We may learn from that Text, that then there was not such an equality among the Ministers of the Church, *Quin unus aliquis authoritate & consilio præesset*, i. e. But that some one person was in authority and counsel above the rest. And in a long Letter

of

of his to an old friend, who now was made a Bishop in the Church of *Rome*, *Veteri amico nunc Præsuli*, it is to be found in the Volume of his *Opuscula*, *pag.* 72. he saith, *Episcopatus ipse a Deo profectus est*, Episcopacy it self is from God, & *institutus*, and institute by God: and within a few Lines after, addeth, *In æstimando Episcopi munere neq; recte neq; tuto credi populo: Judicium unius Dei esse audiendum, Cujus & auctoritate est constitutum illud & legibus definitum*, i. e. In esteeming of the Episcopal Office, we must not regard the people's judgement, but Gods only, by whose authority it is constitute, &c. And sundry other clear Testimonies in that Epistle, which were tedious here to recite. There he speaks not one word against the Office of a Bishop, but only against the abuses of it in the *Romish* Church. In one place of it, he saith, *omnino tibi sane quod ab Episcopo requiritur præstandum, aut sedes Episcopi deserenda*, i. e. either do the duty of a Bishop, or leave the Bishop's Seat: He willeth him not to leave it on any terms, no, but if he minds to be faithful keep it still. And in an Epistle

of his to the King of *Poland*, he approveth of all the degrees of the Hierarchy in the ancient Church, even unto Patriarchs. And in a long Epiſtle to the Duke of *Somerſet* Protector of *England* in *Edward* the ſixth, his Minority, as it is cited by *Durel* View of Govern. *pag.* 165. Giving his advice anent reforming of many things in Religion, yet never adviſeth to remove Epiſcopacy out of the *Engliſh* Church, which had he been of your opinion, he would not have failed to have done: Only he adviſeth that both Biſhops and Miniſters be put to ſwear they ſhall deliver no other Doctrine, but ſuch as is contained in the articles of Religion. And what is worthy the obſerving in that Letter, he ſaith, *Audio eſſe duo ſeditioſorum genera, quæ adverſus Regem & Regni ſtatum caput extulerunt: alij enim cerebroſi quidem*, viz. *ſub Evangelij nomine* ἀταξίαν, *paſſim invectam vellent: alij vero in ſuperſtitionibus Antichriſti obdurantur: ac merentur quidem tum hi tum illi gladio ultore coerceri*, i. e. "I hear there are two ſorts of ſedi-
"tious perſons, who have gotten up the
"head againſt the King and State of the
"King-

" Kingdom: The firſt a kind of heady
" humorous people, who under pretence
" of the Goſpel would bring in confuſi-
" on, and diſorder every where: The
" other are ſuch who are hardned in their
" antichriſtian ſuperſtitions: and theſe
" in authority ſhould reſtrain both. Now
how near what he ſaith of the firſt ſort,
may touch your ſelves, I leave it to your
conſideration: There is one paſſage
more in *Calvin*, I cannot ommit, in his
Treatiſe to the Emperour *Charles* the fifth,
and States of the *Empire*, intituled, *de
neceſſitate reformandæ Eccleſiæ*, ſpeaking
of the *Popiſh* Biſhops, he ſaith, *Talem no-
bis ſi Hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua ſic
emineant* Epiſcopi, *ut Chriſto ſubeſſe non
recuſent & ab illo tanquam unico capite
pendeant & ad ipſum referantur, in qua
ſic inter ſe fraternam ſocietatem colant, ut
non alio nodo quam ejus veritate ſint colli-
gati: tum vero nullo non anathemate dig-
nos fatear, qui eam non reverenter, ſumma-
que obedientia obſervent: hæc vero mendax
Hierarchiæ larva quid habet ſimile?* That is,
if they will give us ſuch an Hierarchy, in
which Biſhops will ſo be great, that
withal they refuſe not to be ſubject to

Chriſt as their only head, and aim at him, in which they ſo intertain brotherly ſociety among themſelves, that they be not knit together by any bond but his Truth; Then if there be any that ſhall not reverence and obey ſuch an Hierarchy, there is no curſe or anathema which they are not worthy of. Thus he. So that if the *Popiſh* Biſhops would renounce their dependance on the Pope, as their head, and in his ſtead own *Chriſt*, and imbrace the truth of the Goſpel Doctrine; *Calvin* would have all to reverence and obey them, and thinks them worthy to be curſed, who would not. By this time you may perceive *Calvin* is not ſuch an oppoſite to Biſhops as you took him to be. He knew very well what great difference there was betwixt *Primitive* and *Popiſh* Epiſcopacy; nor would he cry down all *Epiſcopacy* as intolerable, antichriſtian, and I know not what, as is ordinary for many now to do, who underſtand little, either of the nature or antiquity of it. *Saravia* ſaith, he defendeth *Calvin's* opinion againſt *Beza*: and truly although *Beza* be no ſuch unfriend to Biſhops as many ap-

apprehend, yet *Calvin* far leſs. *B. Hall*, ſpeaking againſt the common report, that fathered *Presbytery* upon *Calvin*, ſaith, I cannot find the Father of *Presbytery*: and Mr. *Durel View of Government*, *Pag.* 151. ſaith, neither was *Geneve* it's mother: and thinks that the juncture of affairs brought it to the doors of theſe Churches, where it was taken in, and maintained, and that (as he ſaith afterward) it was a Government not of choice, but of chance or neceſſity: He cites Mr. *Hooker*, who in the preface to his *Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, ſaith, that the *Popiſh* Biſhop and Clergie being departed *Geneva* (the Biſhop was put away not by the reformed, but by the Papiſts themſelves. See *Durel*, *Pag.* 157, 158, 159.) it had been a thing impoſſible to have choſen another in his room. And *Durel*, *Pag.* 152. ſaith, *it doth not at all appear that the Miniſters who firſt reformed* Geneve (Calvin *was not then come*) did ſettle equality out of *any diſlike to Hierarchical ſubordination, but were bent upon the reforming of doctrine, and then finding themſelves in an equality without any Church Superior over them, they even continued ſo.*

D. *Yet ſince that time many able men who lived under Presbyterian parity, have defended it as good and warrantable.*

I. True, many have indeed brought what they could in defence of it, but the ableſt and moſt judicious of them have only brought reaſons to prove the lawfulneſs, as they conceived of what was done among them, but not that there was any neceſſity of doing ſo in other reformed Churches, which had retained Biſhops. *Blondel* concluded his *Apologia pro ſententia Hieronimi*, with words to this purpoſe: By *all which, we have ſaid to aſſert the rights of Presbytrie, it is not our purpoſe to invalidat the ancient and Apoſtolical conſtitution of Epiſcopal Preeminence, but we believe, wherever it is eſtabliſhed conformable to the ancient Canons, it muſt be carefully preſerved*, and whereſoever by ſome heat of contention, or otherwiſe it hath been put *down or violated, it ought to be reverently reſtored.* See for this *Durel's* view of Government, *Pag.* 339, 340. Where alſo is ſhewed, how by the importunity of ſome, the author was prevailed with to leave out theſe words at the Preſs. *Beza de Miniſtro-*

rum

rum gradibus, *Cap.* 18. Speaking of *England's* having Biſhops, ſaith, *fruantur ſane iſta Dei beneficentia, quæ utinam illi nationi ſit perpetua*: That is, let *England* enjoy that goodneſs of God to them, which I wiſh may be perpetual to that Nation. And *Cap.* 21. *Pag.* 343. *Nedum ut quod falſiſſime & impudentiſſime quidam nobis objiciunt, Cupiam eccleſiæ ſequendum noſtrum peculiare exemplum præſcribamus imperitiſſimorum illorum ſimiles, qui nihil niſi quod ipſi agunt rectum putat.* i. e. "Much leſs as if (which ſome moſt "falſly and impudently charge us with) "we did preſcribe our example of Go- "vernment to be followed by any other "Church, like thoſe unskilfull perſons "who think nothing right but what they "do themſelves. You ſee then, *Beza* thought not other Proteſtant Churches were obliged to write after *Geneva's* Copy, nor did he wiſh a change of the *Engliſh* Epiſcopacy.

D. Beza *is no friend to* Biſhops, *as appears by* Saravia's *writing againſt him.*

I. *Beza* looked not upon all kind of Epiſcopacy as unlawful, as you do, it's true he thought Epiſcopacy but an humane-

mane Inſtitution, as he expounds his *Epiſcopus humanus*, yet he was far from your way of condemning Epiſcopacy abſolutely, but thought it a lawful and uſeful order in the Church. In his diſpute with *Saravia*, he ſaith, *Si qui ſunt (Quod ſane mihi non facile perſuaſeris) qui omnem Epiſcoporum ordinem rejiciunt, abſit ut quiſquam ſanæ mentis furoribus illorum aſſentiatur*, i.e. If there be any (as I hardly believe there are) who reject all the order of Biſhops, God forbid any man of a ſound mind, ſhould aſſent to their madneſs. *Beza* was not againſt *Proteſtant Biſhops* at all, for in a Letter to Arch-biſhop *Whitgift*, related in the ſaid Arch-biſhop's life, written by Sr. *George Paul*, he ſpeaketh thus; *In my writings, I ever impugned the Romiſh Hierarchy, but never intended to touch or impugn the Policy of the Church of* England, *or to exact of you to form your ſelves to our pattern.* How reſpectfully writeth he to *Grindal* Biſhop of *London*, *Epiſt.* 23. he ſaith, *Quo majore poſthac pœna digni erunt, qui porrò authoritatem tuam aſpernabuntur.* i. e. "How much greater puniſh-"ment ſhall they deſerve who ſhall diſ-

"piſe

" piſe your authority. Thus *Beza* ſpeaks to that Biſhop, and thinks his authority ought to be reverenced. And in the cloſe of that ſame Epiſtle, he ſaith, *Jeſus te cuſtodiat, & in tanto tibi commiſſo munere ſancto ſuo ſpiritu regat, & magis ac magis confirmet.* i. e. " Jeſus preſerve " you, govern, and more and more confirm you by his holy ſpirit, in that great Office which is committed to you. And *Epiſt.* 58. To the ſame *Grindal*, he ſaith, *Dominus te iſthic ſpeculatorem & judicem conſtituit.* Now from theſe favourable Teſtimonies of *Beza* in behalf of Epiſcopacy, we may conclude; 1. That he did not think *Epiſcopacy* unlawful, elſe would he have wiſhed the continuance of an unlawful, ſinful Government in *England*, as I ſhew you a little before expreſly he doth? 2. If *Beza* thought Preſbytrie the firſt and Apoſtolical Government, yet certainly he judged it not unalterable, otherwiſe would he have ſpoken with ſuch reſpect of *Epiſcopacy*, as you ſee he doth. The ſame may be ſaid of *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, *Morton*, &c. their conceſſions laboriouſly ſet down, in *jus divinum Miniſterij Anglic. Pag.* 59, 60, 61. Cer-

61. Certainly these Bs. if they thought not Episcopacy, *jure divino*, neither thought they Presbytry so, else would they have been Bishops themselves? And *Calvin* how respectfully writeth he to Arch-bishop *Cranmer*, beside what I cited out of him before? *Durel* View of Government, *Pag.* 161. Speaking of *Calvin*, saith, he is of the mind that Episcopacy was the Government that *Calvin* approved most; and that he took it to be of Apostolical Institution; though his opinion was, that the Church according to her exigencies, in relation to places, times, and other circumstances, may dispense with it. Thus he speaks of *Calvin*, and subjoyneth a passage out of his Epistle to Cardinal *Sadolet*, which he conceiveth is to that purpose; *Disciplinam qualem habuit vetus ecclesia nobis deesse, neque nos diffitemur*, &c.

D. *I confess* I *am somewhat moved with these clear Testimonies you cite out of* Calvin, *and* Beza; *whom I ever looked on before as stout impugners of all kind of* Episcopacy; *Yet that I may add some moe of greatest note, who have withstood Bishops. What say you to* Salmasius, Moulin, Chamier, Blon-

Blondel? *These four may come in the second rank of Protestant worthies, and have all declared themselves against Bishops; Moulin* de munere pastorali, *and in his letters to Bp.* Andrews; Salmasius *in his Walo Messalinus*: Chamier *in his* Popish Controversies: Blondel *in his* Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi?

I. Salmasius did retract his opinion, and turned to the Episcopal perswasion, as himself declares in his answer to *Milton*, cited by *Durel*, Pag. 297. speaking of Bishops, and of his own Observation how confusions and strange errors sprang up in *England*, immediatly upon the removal of Bishops, he saith of himself, *experientia edoctum, ut dies sequens est magister prioris, sententiam mutasse*, &c. i. e. He being taught by experience, as the following day is teacher of the former, he changed his opinion. But setting this aside, as also what we heard *Blondel* closed his Apology with, let us but hear how far by evidence out of antiquity they are forced to yield: *Salmasius* in his *Walo Messalinus* grants, *rem esse antiquissimam, ut hi duo ordines in ecclesia fuerint distincti, Episcoporum &*

Pres-

Presbyterorum; si excipiantur Apostolica tempora, i. e. It is a most ancient thing, that Presbyters and Bishops have been distinct in the Church, if we except the Apostles own times, and *Cap.* 4. *Pag.* 553. *circa medium aut initium secundi seculi primus singularis Episcopatus supra Presbyteratum introductus est*, Where he grants Episcopacy about the beginning of the second age, so very near he grants Bishops to the Apostles times; for the Apostle *John* died about the beginning of the second age. *Moulin* grants, *Statim post Apostolorum tempora, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut testatur historia Ecclesiastica, constitutum esse ut unus inter ceteros Presbyteros Episcopus vocaretur qui in collegas haberet præeminentiam, ad vitandam confusionem, quæ sæpe ex æqualitate nascitur*, i. e. Immediatly after the Apostles, or even in their time, one among the Presbyters was set over the rest with the name of Bishop. Where he saith, this might have been, *Apostolorum tempore*, even in the Apostles time. *Chamier de Oecumen. Pontif. lib.* 10. *cap.* 6. confesses from *Jerom's* making Bishops as ancient at *Alexandria* as *Mark*, *Inæqualitatem hanc esse*

esse antiquissimam, that this inequality among Church-men is most ancient. And a little after he saith, *Conjicere licet innovationem hanc factam, aut nondum elapso aut vix elapso primo seculo.* i. e. "We may "conjecture this change into Episcopacy "was made either before the first age of "the Church was ended, or scarce end-"ed. Now *John* the Apostle outlived the first age, and died in the beginning of the second. Now do not these concessions amount to as much as a yielding of the whole Cause. But let us allow any of those four Divines as long a time after the Apostles as they will demand before Bishops were introduced: and we shall hear *Blondel* say, and the authors of *jus divinum Ministerij Anglic.* Pag. 124. from him, that before the year 140. there was not a Bishop over Presbyters, and that the, *Toto orbe decretum*, in *Jerome* was not long before the said year 140. Thus *Blondel* who takes the longest time for bringing in Bishops, yet acknowledges them so early, that within 40. years and less, after the Apostle *John*, Bishops are every where settled in the Church. Now from your opinion of

the

the unalterableneſs of Preſbyterian Government left by the Apoſtles, and from *Blondel's* conceſſion, that within leſs than 40. years of the Apoſtle *John*, Biſhops were by an univerſal decree received into the Church: I thus reaſon. If there were *Biſhops* found in the Church within leſs then 40. years after the Apoſtles times, there behoved to be *Biſhops* in the Apoſtles times, otherwiſe one of theſe abſurdities will follow, none of which can be admitted. 1. That that Generation of Chriſtians who lived about 40. years and leſs after the *A*poſtles, was altogether ignorant of Chriſt and his *A*poſtles mind anent the continuing of *Preſbyterian parity* as the unalterable form of Government, elſe they would not have adventured, and that ſo unanimouſly upon a change of that Government which had a *jus divinum*, for it's warrant. *A*nd is this probable, or is it poſſible, that thoſe who lived ſo near to the *A*poſtles, that without queſtion, ſundry of them had ſeen *John* and converſed with him: That theſe, I ſay, ſhould all be ignorant of *John's* mind anent Church-government. Or elſe it will follow (which is

yet

yet worse) that that Generation brought in *Episcopacy* notwithstanding they knew Christ and his Apostles had left *Parity* as unalterable in the Church. And that thus over the belly of knowledge and conscience, they did all as one man (for we hear not of the least opposition, as we read there was against other Innovations, which perverse and Heretical Spirits laboured to bring early into the Church) conspire against Christ and his Apostles Government. Were not this hard to be imagined, that those Christians who were daily dying for Christ and the Gospel, should at the same time be guilty of bringing into the Church, a Government contrary to his mind : and that against their own light ? What remains then , but this , if within fourty years after the Apostles, *Bishops* were generally received in the Christian world, by the confession of your ablest Writers; there behoved to be *Bishops* even in the Apostles time. For it is not conceivable how such a great change should be made in so short a time ; and that without any noise or opposition, for any thing we hear , unless you admit these absurdities,

which

which I think you will be loath to do. For had there been either knowledge or conſcience in but a few, whither Miniſters or other Chriſtians of that time; is it poſſible they would have ſuffered that change, which imported ſo groſs a violation, paſs ſo ſmoothly, and without very great contradiction? But further, to let you ſee that thoſe Divines come even as great a length as needeth to be deſired, *Blondel* in his *Apologia*, *Pag.* 25. Speaking of the very firſt meetings of Preſbyters, that were in the beginning of Chriſtianity, he ſaith, *Antiquiſſimo inter Collegas primatus contigit*, i. e. The primacy fell upon the eldeſt, and *Pag.* 53. he grants, that this firſt Preſbyter had the chief hand in Ordination: and afterward that it was for this place that *Diotrephes* made ſo much ado, and is called by the Apoſtle φιλοπρωτεύων. And *Thebuthus* did the like at *Jeruſalem* ſhortly after. And again he confeſſes that this *Primus Presbyter* had authority with his precedency, *quis enim*, ſaith he, *Præſidentiam ſine authoritate ſomniet*? and leſt, it ſeems, he be thought to give too much power to that ἔξαρχος or chief Preſbyter,

as

indeed he giveth him an Episcopal power, he addeth, *Ego sane hanc Politiæ formam ab initio observatam, & Christianis traditam, libere crediderim, sed ut mutabilem & pro usu & arbitrio Ecclesiæ mutandam.* Where, after he hath confessed a first *Presbyter* with an *Episcopal* power in effect, finding this too high a concession, which yet truth enforceth him to, he sayeth, that that form was mutable at the pleasure of the Church. And *Chamier* confesseth that there was always from the beginning, a *Primus Presbyter* or first Minister, and that he had *Novam potestatem & Jurisdictionem, ne esset* Episcopatus *merus titulus*, i. e. "A new pow-"er and Jurisdiction, that his Episcopa-"cy might not be a meer title. This he confesseth when pressed with Testimonies out of antiquity. And what needs more than we find *Blondel* and him confessing. And *Moulen* in *Epist.* 3. to Bishop *Andrews* at last granteth, that *Ordo Episcopalis est juris Apostolici*, i. e. The Episcopal Order is by Apostolical right: and then lest he should seem by this concession altogether to have yielded up the Cause to the Bishop: he subjoyneth a

di-

distinction betwixt *jus Apostolicum*, and *jus divinum*. And that although he grant Episcopacy to have *Apostolical* warrant, yet that will not infer a *Divine* unalterable warrant; for, saith he, some things which were brought into the Church by Apostolical prudence, as fit for that time, are now abrogate as *Deaconesses*. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*, Pag. 230. useth this same evasion. To whom the *learned and judicious Author of the account of ancient Church-government*, among other things returns this answer, that it's granted, that some Apostolical practices, yea, and constitutions are alterable, because they were introduced by the Apostles, upon reasons and considerations not holding equally for all places, times and persons: but if some be thus alterable, yet it follows not that therefore any or all are so. And then the question will be, who shall judge what practices are alterable, what not? or when the reasons of them are dispensable, when not? Now I suppose none can rationally say, that any private man, or lesser part of a Society is competent Judge of these practices and reasons; else what con-

confusion will ensue, every one establishing, or abrogating what he pleaseth, but this belongeth to the Church in her Representativ's; and accordingly we find *Bishops* and *Councils* have retained and declared *Episcopacy* downward from the Apostles, through many Centuries of years, as the standing unalterable Apostolical Government, and that reasons of its first Institution do hold still, to wit, preservation of Unity, shunning of Schism and the like: But these Apostolical practices which were founded on temporary reasons and occasions, were permitted to run into a desuetude. Thus you see what shifts the ablest Pens who have set themselves against Episcopacy, are driven unto, to shun a Conquest. And truely by their great concessions which they are forced to from evidence in antiquity, they yield the whole Cause. Hence it is we find them speaking so uncertainly in their Writings. Sometime one would think disputing down all *Bishops*, or rather up *Presbytrie*: at an other time setting up *Bishops* higher, and more early than their purpose can well allow, or consist with

the Scope of their Debates: sometime again expressing their great respect for *Bishops*, and sincere wishes that such Churches as had them might still retain that happiness, as I hinted before. And I also shew that their purpose mainly was to vindicate the practice of their own Churches in having *parity*, and not to cry down *Episcopacy*, especially that which was in Protestant Churches, as *Beza* expressly professes; so did *Blondel* in the close of his *Apologia*, of which, I spoke before.

D. *There have been many moe Protestant Divines of great note, who lived since the Reformation in Europe, may be many of those have been no friends to* Episcopacy.

I. Durel View of Government, supposeth a Council to be called, consisting of the most famous Protestant Divines, who since the Reformation have lived in all the Churches abroad, *France*, *Geneve*, *Suitzerland*, *Bohem*, *Poland*, *Holland*, and the sundry parts of *Germany*, &c. And maketh *Calvin* Moderator, and puts Episcopacy to the Vote among them, and out of their Writings delivereth their opinion

nions in favours of *Episcopacy*. You may see this at length in *Durel's View of Government*, from *Pag.* 199. to *Pag.* 309. And to them I may add our own *John Knox*, who, as is to be seen before the old Psalm Book, in the year 1560. preached in *Edinburgh*, at the admission of the *superintendent* of the three *Lothians* (a diocy large enough) which act was more Episcopal like than Presbyterian. Thus I have deduced unto you *Episcopacy* from Scripture, from the most primitive times which followed after the Apostles, and from the confessions and concessions of the ablest Protestant Divines: all which, I think, ought, and will be very convincing to any who is pleased to lay aside prejudice, and impartially make search after truth in this point.

To what I have said before, I add these few things. The Author of *Jus Divinum Ministerij Anglicani*, are at great pains to produce some Fathers, Schoolmen, and some Episcopal Divines in *England*, who were of opinion, that betwixt *Presbyter* and *Bishop* there is little or no difference. To which, I say, that the debate among the Schoolmen is meer-

ly, whether Bishop and Presbyter, are *diversi ordines*, different orders, or only *diversi gradus ejusdem ordinis*, divers degrees of one and the same Order. Now this says nothing against Episcopacy, for even these, who think they differ only in degree, yet notwithstanding might be of the mind, that always from the Apostles downward there were Bishops distinct from Presbyters; howbeit the difference was not so great as to constitute a different Order, but only a higher degree, or eminency (as some speak) in the same Order. And these Fathers and late Episcopal Divines might be of the same mind. This is sure, all of them looked on Episcopacy as lawful and useful in the Church.

The said Authors of *Jus Divinum Minist. Angli.* Pag. 64. say, that *Eusebius*, *Irenæus* and others, &c. were in many things deceived themselves, and the cause of deceiving others. *Answ.* 1. They are hard put to it when they seek to relieve themselves by discrediting these ancients. 2. Suppone it were granted that *Eusebius* was in some things deceived, must he therefore all along be deceived when he

speaks

ſpeaks of Biſhops ſuperior to Preſbyters. He makes it a great part of his work to ſet down the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in the moſt famous Primitive Churches, and to ſay, that in all this he was deceived, is *Gratis dictum*, ſaid, but not proved. 3. It's ſtrange if alſo *Irenæus* was deceived, who flouriſhed above a hundred years before *Euſebius*, and had ſeen *Polycarp*, who was the Apoſtle *Johns* contemporary and diſciple. Who can believe he could be ignorant what the Government of the Church had been from the Apoſtles downward, living ſo near to their times. 4. Is it not much more probable that *Jerome* might be deceived, if we underſtand him to ſpeak of the introducing of Biſhops after the Apoſtles times? Certainly it is more like he might be miſtaken than either *Euſebius* or *Irenæus*, who lived long before him. They ſay further, that *Irenæus* by Biſhops meant no more but Preſbyters, *Pag.* 114, 115. And *Pag.* 65. that the Fathers and Councils ſpake of Church-Officers of former times, according to the Stile of their own times. And again when preſſed with the Catalogues of Biſhops out of *Irenæus* and

others, they say, that these Bishops were only the first ordained Presbyters, and therefore this first ordained Presbyter is named and the rest passed by for the more expedit reckoning, and the Line of Succession only drawn from the first ordained Minister. Some of these answers are inconsistent; For 1. They say, *Eusebius* and *Irenæus* were deceived when they spoke of Bishops: and next they say that by the Bishops, *Irenæus* only meant Presbyters. Now how unsatisfactory these answers and the like are, the impartial Reader may judge. Only hear what *Bucer* says, *De animarum cura inter scripta Anglicana*, Pag. 280. Where after he hath related *Jerom's* words, which seem to make Bishops of later date than the Apostles, he saith, *Credibile non est, diu neq; etiam in cunctis Ecclesiis ita observatum esse. Nam apud patres Hieronymo vetustiores clara habemus testimonia quod etiam Apostolorum temporibus unus e Presbyteris electus atq; ordinatus est qui cæteris omnibus præesset —— & Ministerium Episcopale præcipue & in summo gradu gesserit.* Where he shews, that even from the Apostles downward there was in the chief

Churches

Churches always a Biſhop over Preſbyters. And ſo he goeth on to ſhew that *James* was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and that the like Order was keeped in other Churches, *Quantum ex omnibus hiſtoriis Eccleſiaſticis cognoſcere poſſumus*, and cites *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, to prove this; All more ancient than *Jerome*.

D. *I confeſs you have cleared me of ſundry doubts I had anent Biſhops, I thought little or nothing could be ſaid for them, but that they were a meer groundleſs, and godleſs uſurpation in the Church: for we have been taught to cry them down by all means, yet there is one thing, ought, I think, barr them to the door of this Church for ever: and that is the Covenants by which we are ſworn againſt them. But ſince I can ſtay no longer with you at this time, I am content to hear what you can ſay to this at next meeting.*

I. Much more might be ſaid for Biſhops Yet there is enough ſaid if you be free of prejudice. And ſince you can ſtay no longer, I ſhall be willing to commune with you anent the Obligation of the *Covenant* againſt Biſhops, at another time: and ſo I bid you farewel.

If *Blondel* when he says, *pag.* 53. *Equidem hanc politiæ formam ab initio observatam libere concederem, sed mutabilem tamen*, &c. Speak of a primitive parity, yet saith, that form was mutable. *Præfat. ad apolog. pag.* 59. *Hieronymus hanc formam* (i. e. Episcopacy) *non modo non improbavit, sed pro pacis bono semper admisit.* And in that same place vindicats *Jerome* from Aerianism. And in that same place he says Episcopacy is *forma regiminis non per se mala & damnabilis, sed adnatis sensim corruptelis* (viz. under poprie) *vitiata*; and denys not, but that *protestanti sola corruptelarum resectione contenti esse poterant, & vitiatam deplorabant.* And more to this purpose, he thought therefore Episcopacy in it self lawful.

Cassand

Hassand. Consult. Artic. 14. Illi certe merito reprehendendi sunt, qui odio abusuum in his ordinibus & dignitatibus, universum hunc ordinem quem Hierarchicon appellant, ut nervum Antichristi sublatum volunt. Nec minus illi accusandi, qui inani titulo inflati, eoque ad dominatum quendam vel etiam ad cupiditatem & avaritiam abutentes, neglecto quod Ecclesiæ debent officio; hominibus etiam non malis huic Ecclesiastico ordini, detrahendi, & ab eo deficiendi, occasionem dederunt.

THE SECOND DIALOGUE

Anent the Obligation of the Covenants against Episcopacy.

Doub. *HAving some spare time, I am come to spend it with you. (as I promised at our last parting) I told you then, that Bishops are abjured in the Covenant, so that none may with a good conscience either submit to, or join with them: and we look upon all those Ministers that preach under them, as perjured persons.*

I. Ye use indeed upon all occasions to be liberal enough in charging Ministers and many others in the time with *Perjury*, and this ye do with the greatest freedome and confidence imaginable, but it is sooner said than prov'd. Ye would act more Christian like, if ye were more sparing in *judging another mans Servants, who stand or fall to their own Master.* Ye

uſe to impute unto us acting againſt our own Light alſo. I pray, learn to be more Charitable.

D. *You know there were* Covenants *ſworn, wherein* Biſhops *are abjured, and we all ſtand bound againſt them.*

I. All bound! There are many both people and Miniſters at this day who never took the Covenant, and think you them bound againſt Biſhops?

D. *Yes, I think they are: For the* Covenant *bindeth all, not only thoſe who took it, but their Poſterity alſo.*

I. That is a ſtrange fancy: Caſuiſts ſay, *Juramentum eſt vinculum perſonale*, i. e. an Oath is a perſonal tye, that only bindeth him that took it. And ſo conſonant to this, the Covenant ſayeth, *We, every one for our ſelves*: and not, for our ſelves and our poſterity. I ſuppone the Father who was in his judgement againſt Biſhops did take the Covenant; his Son who groweth up afterward is in his judgement for Biſhops: It ſeemeth very hard that the Son ſhould be by the Father's Oath prelimited in his judgement about a diſputable point, or elſe obliged to act contrary to his judgement. Is not this very hard, think you? D. *If*

D. *If the Fathers Oath cannot bind the Child, What say you to the* Baptismal Vow, *where the father voweth for the child, and that vow obligeth the child when he groweth up?*

I. The father at Baptism doth not formally bind in the name and room of the child, he only bindeth for his own part, that, he shall bring up the child as becometh a christian parent, and mind him of his Baptismal Vow when he cometh to years: Indeed the child cometh under a Vow at Baptism, which ariseth from the binding matter, which in it self is obligatory, and from the nature of the Sacrament in which the Lord and the Party Baptized do Covenant; and this maketh the childs obligation so much the stronger when his Vow is superadded to the matter, which is of it self binding, like that, *Psal.* 119. *vers.* 106.

D. *Yet those persons who took the* Covenant, *are bound never to acknowledge the* Bishops, *and now after they have sworn they must not anymore dispute or question the obligation of the Oath: for* Prov. 20. vers. 25. It is a snare after vowes, to make inquiry.

I. Salomon there speaketh of those who

who ſacrilegiouſly meddle with things conſecrate, and would pervert them to their own private uſe: and who, that they may do it the better, make enquiry how the Vow may be eluded, by which thoſe things were conſecrate. Queſtionleſs it's a ſnare to make inquiry out of ſuch ſacrilegious deſign. But *Solomon* meaneth not that it's ſimply and in every caſe unlawful, after we have vowed or ſworn an Oath, to enquire whither our Vow or Oath be in every caſe binding, yea or not: otherwiſe you ſhall lay a very great ſnare indeed upon ſuch as tye themſelves with a raſh or ſinful Oath, if you will not allow them to reflect on what they have done. What! I pray you, had it been a fault in *Herod* to have made enquiry after his raſh Oath to *Herodias*, and to have retracted it too? Or for thoſe who bound themſelves under a curſe, *they would neither eat nor drink until they had killed* Paul? Verily I think there ſhould be liberty allowed to many who did ſwear the Covenant, to make enquiry, if there were no reaſon but this, becauſe many took it when they were very young at Schools and Colledges,

ledges, and ſo by reaſon of none age, could very little judge of the nature of an Oath, and far leſs of the matter abjured: and ſo did not ſwear in judgement, contrary to *Jerem.* 4. *verſ.* 2. ſuch have even but reaſon to make a review when they come to be better able to judge.

D. *It may be ſo, yet I think when they have enquired they ſhall find themſelves bound againſt* Prelacy *by a double tye*, viz. the National Covenant and the League.

I. You think *Epiſcopacy* is abjured in the *National Covenant*, under the name of the *Popes wicked Hierarchy*. But *Proteſtant Epiſcopacy* is not there meant, as the author of the *Survey of Naphtaly* fully ſheweth, Part 2. from *pag.* 114. to 130. 1. Becauſe King *James* and his *Council* who were the impoſers of that Covenant, and took it themſelves, *Anno* 1580. did the very next year after 1581. ratifie the agreement made at *Leith* betwixt the Commiſſioners of State and Church, *Anno* 1571. Which agreement was in favours of Epiſcopacy. Now if the King and his Council had by the *Poniſh Hierarchy* meant all kind of Epiſcopacy,

pacy, is it probable that the very next year they would by that Ratification have acted so palpably contrary to the Covenant so lately taken by themselves, and imposed upon the Land by their Authority. 2. That *Protestant Episcopacy* was not meant, appeareth from this, because in all the strivings the Church in those times had with the King to get him to put away *Bishops* even after the taking of that *Covenant*, we never find this used as an argument to perswade the King, because all *Episcopacy* was abjured in the *Covenant*. Which reason, no doubt, would much have been insisted on, if Ministers then had thought all kind of Episcopacy to be meant by the *Popes wicked Hierarchy*; and their not using this argument may be very convincing to any, that by the *Popes Hierarchy* no Episcopacy could be meant, but such as depended upon the *Pope*: for I suppose the Ministers of that time were not ignorant of the meaning of these words of the Covenant. I also told you at our last meeting that *Beza* professed he never intended to write against Protestant Bishops.

D. *What*

D. *What can the Popiſh Hierarchy be meant of, if not of Biſhops?*

I. The Pop's *Hierarchy* is meant of Popiſh Biſhops, who actually depended on the *Pope*: but can no more be meant of Proteſtant reformed Biſhops, who have renounced their dependance upon the Pope, then of reformed *Presbyters*, or *Miniſters* and *Deacons*: Otherwiſe according to you, all Miniſters and Deacons ſhould be abjured there als well as all Biſhops: becauſe Preſbyters and Deacons are parts of their Hierarchy, as the Council of *Trent* determines.

D. *The Apologetical Narration, pag. 395. ſaith all Biſhops depend upon the Pope; therefore all kind of Epiſcopacy is Popiſh, and as ſuch, abjured in that Covenant.*

I. He ſaith indeed, all Biſhops, *in eſſe & operari*, depend on the Pope, but how proves he it? Becauſe, ſaith he, the Pope acknowledges they depend on him alone, and have no other ground to ſtand upon. Now what a poor, *becauſe*, this is, and how weakly reaſoned from the Popes ſaying ſo, *ipſe dixit*, is too evident to any ordinary capacity. The

Apologiſt reaſoneth like a Papiſt, that maintaineth the Popes infallibility, and giveth him that advantage of his arrogated ſupremacy and uſurpation over all Biſhops in the Chriſtian world now and from the beginning; as if the very firſt Biſhops in the primitive times had depended on the Biſhop of *Rome*. The Pope craveth no better than this. But herein Proteſtants oppoſe his uſurped Supremacy; and ſhew from antiquity that the Biſhops of *Rome* have been oppoſed by Councils and Fathers, when firſt they attempted the Supremacy. Remember what I cited to you from *Calvin*, at our laſt meeting, *Talem ſi nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant in qua Epiſcopi a Chriſto ut unico capite dependeant, tum nullo non Anathemate*, &c. *Calvin* thinks them worthy of a curſe, who will not ſubmit to ſuch Biſhops, who renouncing the Pope take Chriſt for their head. The Miniſters who did diſpute with the Doctors of *Aberdeen*, declared that the Doctors might take the National Covenant, and notwithſtanding, debate and vote for Epiſcopacy in a free Aſſembly. It ſeemeth then they thought, by the popes

Hierar-

Hierarchy, all kind of *Episcopacy* not necessarily meant.

D. *But the assembly at* Glasgow, Anno 1638. *hath put the matter out of doubt, and by their authority expounded the* Popes Hierarchy *to be meant of all* Episcopacy, *and so all Episcopacy is abjured in that Covenant.*

I. You would all along remember in this debate, that at our last conference I shew you, Episcopacy had a Divine, or Apostolical warrant at least: and if so, then the Covenant against Episcopacy (suppone it were there abjured) is null from the beginning. But passing this, to what you say of the Assembly of *Glasgow's* expounding the Popes *Hierarchy* to be meant of all Episcopacy; I answer, that was more than they could do; For 1. How could the Assembly put a sense upon that Oath, that was taken 58. years before, and few or none of the first takers of it were than alive; or if alive, few or none were Members of that Assembly? How then could the Assembly come to know certainly, that their exposition of the word, *Hierarchy*, was according to the mind of the first impo-

sers.

sers. 2. All that the Assembly 1638. produces in their Act *Sess.* 16. to prove Episcopacy to be abjured in the National Covenant amounts only to this, That the Church about the time of the first taking of that *Covenant*, and after, was labouring against Bishops; but proves not that *Episcopacy* was abjured in it, or in any words of it. 3. By what warrant could the Assembly impose upon others that sense of the Covenant in which they took it themselves; they might declare their own sense of it, which might not be the sense of the first imposers, when all is done: but how could they oblige others to their sense, who had taken it before? The first imposers gave the Assembly no power to do so.

D. *Yet those who took that Covenant after the Assembly* 1638. *had put their sense on it, have thereby abjured Episcopacy; for the Assembly explaineth it so.*

I. I suppose it was not the Assemblies intention, that any should take that Covenant in the sense they put on it, unless it were agreeable to the sense of the first imposers, and takers, to whom the Assembly thought themselves subservient in

what they did. Now that the first imposers, and takers never meant it against all Episcopacy, is shewed: and therefore the Assemblies ground failing, that which they built thereupon must fail also. For it were absurd to say that the Assembly putting a meaning on that Oath no way agreeable with the meaning of the first imposers; that yet this posterior meaning should oblige also, though much differing from the former: this is to make of an Oath what we please.

D. *In that Covenant we are sworn that we shall joyn our selves to this Church of* Scotland, *in Doctrine, Faith, Religion, and Discipline; and that we shall continue in the Doctrine and Discipline thereof. Where, by* Discipline, *is meant*, Presbyterian Government. *So then, we are sworn to maintain it by the National Covenant.*

I. By *Discipline*, cannot be meant Presbyterian Government, because at the time of the first imposing of that Covenant there was no such Government in *Scotland*, nor for a considerable time after. Whatever essays Ministers in those times made to introduce it, yet the King

who

who imposed that Covenant, owned Episcopacy. Therefore, 2. If by Discipline, some one particular mode of Government be meant, it's more then probable that it must be *Episcopacy*, because it was the Government then practised in this Church: And the very year after the King and Council ratified the Treaty that had been concluded at *Leith* in favours of Episcopacy, *Anno* 1571. But by *Dicipline*, is not meant any one particular form of Government, but the substantials of it, or *the essential and utterly necessary policy of the Church*, as it is expressed in the first Book of *Discipline*, *Cap.* 9. And this is indeed unalterable, though, as some think, there may be a change of particular Forms of Government.

D. *Yet in the second Article of the* League, Bishops *are expresly abjured, and I hope you will confess that Protestant Bishops are there meant.*

I. Although *Protestant Bishops* be there meant, yet I question if every kind of *Protestant Bishops*, *Timorcus Epist. dedicat. Sect.* 25. and *pag.* 14. 16. Doubted not to say, that all kind of Prelacy is no

where abjured, but that notwithstanding the said Article, they (the *English* Presbyterians) could freely submit to the Primitive Episcopacy, that is, the precedency of one over the rest, without whom ordinarily nothing is to be done in Jurisdiction or Ordination: and asserts that it was only the *English kind of Prelacy* that was meant in the second Article of the *League*: as also appears from the explanation of that Article inclosed in the body of it, by a Parenthesis. Which kind we have not in *Scotland*, nor had before: although many of you think there is no difference. Mr. *Vines*, and Mr. *Baxter*, two great men of the Presbyterian way in *England*, say, that that second Article was not intended against all kind of Episcopacy, but only against that complex frame that consists of all the Officers mentioned in the Article. And Mr. *Gataker*, that *the most part of the Assembly of Divines was reconcileable to a Moderat Episcopacy.* And further, *Timorcus*, That the *English* Parliament, with the Commissioners from *Scotland*, never intended the extirpation of all kind of Episcopacy, but only of

that

that in *England*, *pag.* 16. 23. See also Mr. *Croſton*, *Pag.* 70, 78. So that the moſt judicious of the *Engliſh* Preſbyterians who knew the mind of the Impoſers, and the circumſtances of that buſineſs, you ſee, would not cry out upon us as guilty of breach of that Article, as ye do.

D. *What was the Parliament of* England *or the Aſſembly of Divines, their ſenſe of that Article, I know not: nor think I my ſelf much concerned to enquire: but the Kirk and State of* Scotland *who impoſed that Oath on us, meant it againſt all ſort of Biſhops.*

I. I pray you conſider we are now ſpeaking of the *League*, which was not a meer National Covenant of this Kingdom alone, but a common League of all the three Kingdoms; and therefore behoved to be ſenſed by the Repreſentatives of all the three. So it is not the ſenſe that any one of the Kingdoms puts on it, you or I are to ſtand to; but that meaning and ſenſe which all the three impoſed on it. And what was the Parliament of *England*'s ſenſe, was as *Timorcus* tells us, with the joynt concurrence

currence of Commissioners from *Scotland*.

D. *In the first Article the preservation of the Government of the Kirk of* Scotland *is sworn to be maintained, which was* Presbytrie; *and therefore in the second we swear against all kind of* Prelacy: *because* Prelacy *and* Presbytrie *are inconsistent.*

I. If you think in the first Article *Presbytrie* is sworn to be maintain'd, and yet that there is a liberty left in the second Article for some kind of *Prelacy*, which I told you the *English* Divines confess; and if withal you think there is an inconsistency betwixt *Presbytrie* and any kind of *Episcopacy*; then it will follow, that we have sworn things contradictory, *viz.* In the first Article that we *shall admit of no kind of Prelacy*, and in the second, *that we may admit of some kind of Prelacy.* 2. It's much doubted by learned men, whither in the first Article there be any Obligation to maintain Presbyterial Government in *Scotland*; For 1. There is no express mention there at all of Prosbyterial Government; The words are (*We shall endevour the preserva-*

tion of the Reformed Religion in the Church of Scotland, *In Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government*) 2. Many known *Independents* took that Covenant, and yet never thought themselves bound thereby to maintain *Presbytrie* in any of the Kingdoms, because they thought it no part of the reformed Government: and no question the *Independents* had a hand in wording that Article so, that the words might not necessarily import the maintaining of any one form of Government in particular contrary to what themselves conceived to be right: and indeed the words do not express any one form, nor yet necessarily import any one form, but with this general *proviso*, *in so far as reformed*, now they did not think Presbyterial Government such.

D. *Yet the body of the* English *Parliament, who, together with our* Scots *Commissioners imposed that Oath, did by the* Reformed Government in this Kirk *mean*, Presbytrie, *which was then setled here: and therefore we were to take, and did take that first Article in the sense of the imposers; whatever were the thoughts of few* Independents. I. W.

I. We are indeed to take an Oath in the ſenſe of the Impoſers: but that the *Engliſh* Parliament ſenſed the firſt Article as if Preſbyterial Government were there ſworn to be maintained; may juſtly be doubted, becauſe, had that Parliament looked on Preſbytery as the Reformed Government, ſworn to be maintained in this Kirk, they conſequently would have acknowledged themſelves bound to reform *England* according to our pattern; but they thought themſelves not bound to do ſo, for *Anno* 1647, in their Declaration to the *Scots* Commiſſioners, they profeſs they could never find that *Presbytrie* is neceſſary by any Divine Right, and charges them for thinking there is no other lawful Church Government, but that which they call Church Government. And alſo charges them with miſ-interpreting the Article of the *Covenant* concerning Church Government.

D. *It ſeems then that* England *and* Scotland *did not underſtand that Article in one and the ſame ſenſe, yet ſince our State and Church underſtood it of* Preſbytrie, *we are bound to it in that ſenſe.*

I. It seems indeed *England* did not understand it in our sense: but that therefore we are bound to it in the sense of our Church and State, will not follow; but rather that it is an *Article*, as to that part of it, that speaks of Government, without sense: since the Imposers who only could give the binding sense, are not agreed about it: for to say that we are bound to that sense, which our State, and Church too, if you will, had of it, is irrational,; because they were but a part of the Imposers, and the lesser part too, in respect of *England* and *Ireland*. And further, suppose it were granted to you, that in that first *Article* *Presbytrie* is meant, yet that therefore there can be no room left for any kind of *Episcopacy* in the second *Article*, will be denyed: for if you think there is an inconsisteney betwixt *Presbytrie* and any kind of *Episcopacy*, either you are mistaken, or *Beza*. And others were, who notwithstanding their writing for *Presbytrie*; yet confess there is a kind of *Prelacy* as ancient as the Apostles; beside what I cited to you from *Blondel*, *Chamier*, *Moulin*, at our last meeting; see

Beza

Beza apud Saravium, pag. 207, 233, 235, 240, 242, 251. &c.

D. *I perceive you bear off all you can from acknowledging the* Episcopacy *now settled in this* Church *to be meant either in the* National Covenant, *or in the* League: *For if that were once granted, then ye could not but confess your selves guilty of* Perjury.

I. My denying the present *Episcopacy* of this Church to be meant in either of the Covenants, is grounded upon reasons which I suppose can not easily be disapproven. And to what you say, that upon our acknowledging the present *Episcopacy* to be meant in both, or either of the *Covenants*, we could not but acknowledge our selves guilty of *Perjury*: Though I see no reason to acknowledge this present Government to be meant in either of the *Covenants*, but much reason to the contrary, yet I am content to make the supposition that it is abjured: giving then, though not granting that this *Episcopacy* was abjured in one, or both of the *Covenants*, you cannot so easily conclude thence, as you imagine, that therefore those who took that *Oath*, and now again submit to, yea, or own

own this re-eſtabliſhed *Epiſcopacy*, are perjured.

D. *That ſeems very ſtrange: thoſe who did ſwear againſt* Biſhops *in the* Covenant, *have they not by acknowledging them again, done contrary to their* Oath, *and ſo are perjured?*

I. That you may receive anſwer to this, you muſt conſider the nature of *Epiſcopacy*, which is the matter ſuppoſed to be abjured. *Epiſcopacy* is either a neceſſary unalterable Government, as having a Divine warrand, or at leaſt *Apoſtolick*, which amounts to little leſs then *Divine*, if to any thing leſs at all. Or it is an unlawful, ſinful Government, as being contrary to ſome other Government, which hath the warrant of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Or, 3. It is of an indifferent Nature, neither commanded nor forbidden, but left to Chriſtian prudence, to be uſed in the Church, or not, as ſhall be found expedient, all circumſtances conſidered. If *Epiſcopacy* be found grounded on the Word, and to have been the only Government practiſed from the Apoſtles own times downward through the pureſt ages of the Church,

Church, I hope you will not think an Oath taken against it obliges to any thing but repentance, for engaging in so unwarrantable an Oath. You are a people who cry out *Perjury Perjury*; but consider what I said to you at last meeting, to let you see what warrant *Bishops* have in the Word of God, and that it is the only Government found in the first and purest times of the Church, search when you will, and that even those who have set themselves to maintain another Government, have from evidence of reason, and Light that shines to them out of Antiquity, been forced by their own concessions to set *Episcopacy* high enough: and till you be able solidly to answer what I said to you then on this head, be more sober, and sparing of your hard censures: and take heed lest while you charge others with *Perjury*, your selves be found doing all you can sacrilegiously to robb the Church of that Government which *Christ* and his *Apostles* left her in possession of, and have bound your selves with an *Oath* so to do. If *Episcopacy* be sinful then we are bound against it antecedently to our Oath,

and whether we had abjured it or not. And if you think *Episcopacy* thus unlawful; you should not so much decry it upon the account of the *Covenant*; but because it is in it self sinful, as contrary to some Divine, or Apostolical warrant: although it's true a supervenient Oath makes an Obligation against a thing in it self sinful, so much the stronger. But as I told you before, the ablest Champions for *Presbyterie*, have not adventured to assert *Episcopacy* unlawful, as being contrary to any Divine, or Apostolical warrant. If it be indifferent, that is, neither commanded nor forbidden, or lawful but not necessary, but left to Christian prudence: Then the question will be, if we could by our Oath make it absolutely, and in every case unlawful to our selves; so that we can never in any case after, own or submit to it. You are mistaken, if you think an Oath against the use of a thing indifferent, so binds, that in no case after, the swearer can lawfully use that thing. *Casuists* say, an Oath taken about an indifferent thing, may in some cases cease to bind (we now suppone *Episcopacy* to

be

be in it ſelf indifferent) if the thing ſworn againſt be a matter, wherein our Superiours have power to command us, They by their authority given them of God, may require obedience from us in any thing lawful; and ſo in that particular, they may command us to do or uſe that which we have ſworn againſt, it being a thing in it ſelf lawful: and in this caſe our Oath ceaſes to bind. 2. If after we have ſworn, there come to be ſuch an alteration in the State of affairs, that what was lawfully promiſed, cannot now be lawfully performed; In this caſe the Oath ceaſes to bind, *Si res non permanent in eodem ſtatu*, ſay Caſuiſts, *ceſſat juramenti obligatio.* Or 3. When our Oath comes to be *Impeditivum majoris boni*, that is, *a hinderance to a greater good*, if we ſtill ſtand to what we have ſworn. In ſuch caſes as theſe the obligation of an Oath about a matter in it ſelf not ſinful, ceaſes to bind: as Caſuiſts commonly teach, and the Author of the *Seaſonable Caſe*; and of the *Survey of Naphtaly* at length applyes to the Oath of the *Covenant* abjuring *Epiſcopacy*, and ſhews, that upon ſuppoſition of the law-

fulneſs of *Epiſcopacy* in it ſelf, and that the *Epiſcopacy* of this Church is meant in the *Covenant*; As matters now ſtand, none ought to think themſelves bound by their Oath to ſtand out againſt it, our Superiours now having commanded us to obey and ſubmit to that Government, &c. And ſolidly repells any thing that is brought by the *Apologiſt*, or *Naphtali* to the contrary. An Oath about things in their own nature not ſinful, but alterable, is always to be taken with this reſtriction and limitation, if not expreſſed yet neceſſarily to be underſtood, *ſo long as lawfully I may*, for the very nature and matter of ſuch an Oath requires this: And the reaſon is, becauſe the takers of ſuch an Oath may be under prior and greater obligations, (*viz. Obedience to their Superiours, and the like*) then any obligation they come under by their Oath, about a matter indifferent: and therefore when it comes to this, that they cannot both ſatisfie thoſe greater and prior obligations and keep their Oath too; Then the Oath being the leſſer obligation, muſt cede and give place to the greater, eſpecially thoſe greater

ſuch

such as obedience to Superiours in things lawful, and the like, being such as God himself hath brought us under, and our Oath about a thing indifferent, being but a knot of mans casting. This should be clear and undoubted to any, that when two duties at one and the same time, seem to require performance of us, and we cannot get them both satisfied, then and in that case, the greater must take place of the lesser, and the lesser is omitted without sin, *Matth.* 9. 13. and 12. 7. *Go and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not Sacrifice.* And therefore *Divines* teach, that every Command doth not oblige at every time.

D. *To what you say of the first case, in which a promissory Oath about a thing indifferent, may cease to bind,* viz. The Authority of Superiours interveening: *you should do well to consider that the obligation of an Oath is a very Sacred Bond, and I think it's hard to say, that the authority of any man can loose the Oath of God; In that case we should say,* We have opened our mouth to the Lord, and cannot go back.

I. And

I. And do you think that by your Oath you can warrantably bind your self up from obeying the Law of God in the fifth *Commandment*, and in many other expreſs Scriptures, that biddeth you *honour and obey your Superiours.* I told you that the Law of God enjoyning obedience to Superiours layes the firſt and greateſt obligation upon you. And further, conſider what a door you would open to fruſtrate *Superiours* of all that obedience, which *Inferiours* owe to them: for when theſe in Authority ſhall require obedience of their Subjects in ſuch a particular, they may anſwer, hold us excuſed, we cannot obey you, for we have ſworn not to do this thing. And if we may thus warrantably ſhift in one thing, why not in another thing? And ſo may by our *Oaths* pre-limite and bind up our ſelves from obeying any thing, which thoſe in Authority can require of us. And thus you may ſee, whether that opinion of yours tends, even to caſt off the Yoke of all Obedience and Subjection, which the Lord ſo expreſly in his Word hath laid upon the necks of Subjects. Read the 30. *Chapter* of *Numbers.* and

there you will see, that if the Wife, or the Daughter in the Fathers House should bind themselves by a Vow, the Husband or Parent had power to anul and make it void: and by proportion and analogie, the King who is *Pater Patriæ*, hath the same power over us.

D. *Yet in that* 30. *of* Numbers, *If the Father or Husband did once confirm the Vow of the Wife or Daughter, though but by a tacite consent, then there was no more voiding of it: Now our Superiours have confirmed the Oath, and therefore I think it can never be made void again.*

I. Read the 15. *vers.* of that 30. of *Numbers*, where you find that even after the Husband hath heard, and by his silence confirmed the Wifes vow (of which was spoken, *vers.* 12.) he hath notwithstanding of his tacite confirmation, still a power of anulling and making void her Vow; and if he do so, she is bound to yield to her Husbands commands, and is exonered of her Vow. Indeed if the Husband (the like may be said of the Parent) do thus without good ground, irritate and make void the Wifes Vow, he is culpable, *he shall bear her sin*, but

she

ſhe is free, becauſe bound to obey her Husband, as being under a prior obligation of obedience unto him by the Law of God. You may conſult Interpreters on that 15. *verſ.* of *Numbers* 30. and ſhall find them expounding it of the Husbands voiding his Wifes Vows, even after he had confirmed them, and if he do ſo, *he ſhall bear her ſin*: that is, ſay ſome, If there be a guilt here it ſhall lye one the Husband who made the Vow void, not on the Wife, who by a prior obligation was bound to obey her husband, and which her poſterior Vow could never free her of. Others expone theſe words, *he ſhall bear her ſin*, thus, *he ſhall take away her ſin*: Now the Husband may take away the Wifes ſin, ſhe doing but her duty in obeying him; and yet he may be guiltleſs too, if he revocked his former confirmation upon juſt and rational grounds. And as to the Wifes part, ſome Interpreters ſay, *Mariti authoritas uxorem abſolvit voto & culpa*, That is, the authority of the Huſband abſolves the Wife of her vow and ſin too. Now the application of this to our own caſe is eaſie.

D. *You*

D. *Your second case wherein you say the obligation of an Oath about a matter in its nature indifferent may cease to bind, is when there comes such a change of affairs, that the* Oath *can no longer oblige without sin: how apply you this to the Oath against Bishops?*

I. Upon supposition that *Episcopacy* is indifferent, and that it is abjured in the *Covenant*: Since that Oath there is this great change of affairs, *Episcopacy* is by Law Re-established, and we commanded to submit to it: so that now we can no longer think our selves bound by our Oath, without palpable disobedience to Authority.

D. *But my Oath against* Bishops *had the first obligation on me, from which I can not be loosed by any Law of Authority that is made after.*

I. Your Oath hath not the first obligation on you, but the Law of God that commands you to be obedient to your Superiours, *viz.* the *fifth Commandment*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. and such like Scriptures. You came under an *Oath* at Baptism that you should obey the will of God, now this is a part of his will, that you obey

the

the lawful Commands of Authority: and this *Oath* or *Vow* you were under before the *Covenant Oath*. If you think your *Oath* can ſecure you from obedience to the Magiſtrate, commanding to do contrary to what you have ſworn: you are in a very dangerous error, and by this means would eaſily elude the expreſs Command of God, *Eccleſi.* 8. 2. The Author of the grand Caſe, *Pag.* 56, 57. tells, that in King *James* his time, ſundry *Jeſuits* went from *England* to *Rome*, and there took an Oath, according to a conſtitution of the *Pope*, that they ſhould return unto *England*, and there Preach the *Catholick* Faith. Wherefore there was a Law made in *England*, prohibiting ſuch practices: Hereupon aroſe the caſe, whether thoſe who had taken that Oath at *Rome* were obliged to obey the Law, though made after their taking of the Oath: and it it was reſolved (abſtracting from the unlawfulneſs of that Oath in it ſelf) that an Oath can not bind againſt a Law, though the Law be made after the Oath is taken.

D. *Your third caſe wherein an Oath ceaſeth to obliege, is, when it becomes*

an

an hinderance to a greater good. *This seemeth to allow people too great a liberty, for how easily may they pretend that some greater good is hindered by adhering to their Oath.*

I. When that *greater good* is a *certain good*, and no otherwise attainable, but by the discharge of our *Oath*, and especially if it be a *good*, we are preobliged to before ever we took the Oath; then as *Casuists* commonly teach, the Oath ceaseth to bind. Now by our Oath against Bishops, these goods are hindred, as matters now stand, *obedience to Authority*, *avoiding of Schism*, *Ministers serving God in the work of the Ministry*, *to which they were called*, &c, by our still adhering to the Oath all these good things are hindred, and are in themselves greater and better *goods* than our adhering to the Oath, which we now suppose is about a thing indifferent: and as to that of Ministers, choicing rather to lay aside their *Ministry* than their *Oath*, it deserves our serious thoughts, whether a Minister can warrantably by any deed of his, especially about an indifferent thing incapacitat himself, or do

that

that which by consequence may incapacitate him for the Ministry. Now many Ministers think, that by their Oath they are warrantably oblieged not to continue in their respective stations, as matters stands. It is incontroverted among Divines, as I hinted before, that lesser duties must give place to the greater, when they come in competition together, and the lesser is omitted, or even, may be, the contrary to it commited, without sin: as *David's* eating the Shew-bread, when he could have no other meat to keep him from starving. *Paul* and his company, their casting the good Creatur's of God unto the Sea, to save their lives, *Act.* 27. 38. Christ will have mercy even to our Beast (much more then to the souls of people) to be preferred to ceasing from all our works on the Sabbath. *He will have mercy and not sacrifice*: No doubt where he can have both, he will: but where not, he will have *mercy* although he lose *sacrifice*, yea, rather than lose *mercy* he will have no *sacrifice*, he prohibits *sacrifice*; Therefore *go and learn*, saith Christ: *what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, as

if

if little understood and less practised, even by the *Pharisees*, the great teachers of those times, and much admired and followed by the people, yet Christ sends them to School again to learn better, and lets them see they were but blind guides, notwithstanding the great opinion the people had of them. So the *Rechabits* judged themselves discharged of the strict observance of their Vow in case of hazard, and self-preservation, *Jer.* 35. *vers.* 9, 10, 11.

D. *Yet for all you have said, you know* Joshua *and the* Princes *when they had sworn to the* Gibeonits. Josh. 9 *They looked on their Oath as so binding that they would not adventure to break it, even after it is discovered to them that these* Gibeonits *were of the* Canaanits *with whom God had commanded them to make no peace, but root out; and* Joshua *and the* Princes *might have said the command of God looseth us from our Oath, and the keeping of it will be a hinderance to a greater good: yet the tye of the Oath was so sacred to them, that they chosed rather to dispense with the command of God in that particular than with their Oath: and that their so doing was acceptable*

table to God, appeareth from his displeasure against Saul, *who many years after killed sundry of these* Gibeonits, *to whose predecessors* Joshua *and the* Princes *had sworn.*

I. I confess, I wonder much you should make use of this argument in the manner you do to prove the obligation of your Oath against *Bishops*: for that place is quite mistaken by you. Therefore first, If you think *Joshua* was forbidden to make peace at all with any of the *Canaanits* upon any terms, but was to root them all out; and yet because of his Oath he spared the *Gibeonits*, though it was contrary to an express command of God; you run your self into a most wild and gross opinion that can not be admitted, *viz.* That an Oath can bind against a Command of God, whether it be a Moral, or particular Command, it is all one. And so as before you asserted an Oath to bind against the command of men in Authority; Now you go a greater length in saying an Oath bindeth against the more immediate Command of God. What man of sound judgement will admit the first, much less the second. 2. You

are

are in a miſtake if you think *Joſhua* had no warrant to make peace with any of the *Canaanits*, but was commanded without ſo much as once treating with them, to root them all out. For *Deut.* 20. *v.* 10. He is commanded to *proclaim peace to any City* indefinitely he came to fight againſt, the *Canaanits* not excepted, only with this difference; 1. No Peace was to be concluded with any of the *Canaanits*, unleſs they became ſervants, and yielded up their Lands, which the Lord had beſtowed upon *Iſrael*, and embraced the true Religion, abandoning their *heatheniſh* Idolatries: And hence ſo frequently *Leagues* are diſcharged to be made with them, they reſerving their *heatheniſh Worſhip*, leſt they ſhould draw away the Children of *Iſrael* from the true God. 2. If any City of the *Canaanits* did refuſe peace, (for there is difference betwixt a meer *Peace* and a *League*, as ſome have obſerved; and that *Joſhua* at the firſt, made a *League* with the *Gibeonits*, but as ſoon as he knew them to be *Canaanits* he breaketh the *League* as being contrary to the Command of God, and meerly alloweth them a *peace*,

Josh. 9. *vers.* 20, 21, 22, 23.) They were to be worse dealt with than any other City that was not of the *Canaanits*; for *Deut.* 20. *vers.* 16, 17. in case of their refusal, nothing was to be saved alive, while other Cities were but to lose the lives of the Males only, *vers.* 12, 13, 14, 15. Read Interpreters on the place: that the *Israelits* were to spare the lives of the *Canaanits* on these terms, appears from their sparing *Rachel* and her friends, *Josh.* 6. 17. Which otherwise had not been lawful for them to do. And from *Josh.* 11. *vers.* 19, 20. Which place clearly shews, that if other Cities of the *Canaanits* had submitted; as *Gibeon* did, *Joshua* might have spared them. And from *Solomons* kindness to those *Canaanits* in his time, 1 *King.* 9. 20, 21. *Ezra* 2. 55, 58. Therefore 3. I say, *Joshua* and the *Princes* by that Oath did swear nothing contrary to the Command of God, but their Oath was consonant to Gods Command, that upon such and such terms they might have peace, so that *Joshua* and the *Princes* were bound to spare them, although they had not sworn. And, 4. The Lord was angry

with

with *Saul* for ſlaying the *Gibeonits*, becauſe it was contrary both to the Command of God, in giving them peace upon their ſubmiſſion, and alſo to *Joſhua's* Oath made to their Fathers: and not meerly becauſe it was contrary to the Oath, as you much miſtake, when you think it did bind contrary to the Command of God. You may conſult the *Criticks*, and other *Interpreters*, collected by Mr *Pool*, as alſo others, on *Joſhua* 9. 18. The *Engliſh Annotations* on *verſ.* 15. &c. And you ſhall find that ſome indeed are of the opinion, that *Joſhua* and the *Princes* were diſcharged to make any peace at all with any of the *Canaanits* (though herein they are oppoſed both by the moſt judicious and numerous) yet thoſe who think that *Joſhua* was commanded to make no peace with them, whom herein you follow, ſay not, that *Joſhua* after he diſcovered the *Gibeonits* to be of the *Canaanits*, was bound to ſtand to his Oath (as ye ſay) It being contrary to an expreſs Command of God: but they ſay *Joſhua* and the *Princes* Oath did not bind. And why *Joſhua* and the *Princes* did not break that Oath, which they

they conceive was not Obligatory, you will find their conjectures on that place. You use also to bring *Zedekiah's* breach of Oath that he made to the King of *Babylon*, with which breach the Lord was so much displeased, as a great argument for you. To which briefly, I say, that *Zedekiah* held the Crown of *Nebuchadnezzar*, and that the Lord by the Prophet had expresly commanded him and the *Jews* to submit to the King of *Babylon*, *Jer.* 27. *vers.* 6, 7, 8, 9, 12. And *Jer.* 38. *vers.* 17, 20, 21. So that whatever may be said for, or against the obligation of *Zedekiah's* Oath in it self, considered with the circumstances of it: yet the Command of God being superadded, enjoyning *Zedekiah* peaceably to submit under him, and no rebel. It's clear, *Zedekiah* was obliged to have done so according to Gods Command, whatever he could pretend to the contrary. So that his breaking the Oath, had in it clear disobedience against Gods Command.

D. David Psal. 15. vers. 4. *Counts it as a mark of a blessed man*, he sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not.

I. Indeed a man may stand unalterably

obliged

obliged by an Oath he hath taken to his own hurt in many things: yet you must know, not in all things: I suppose a man should swear to take away his own life: here an Oath to his own hurt, which I doubt you will say obliges to any thing but repentance. But besides, when a man swears to the hurt of others, of those in Authority, of those of his Family, of the souls of people. You will not say such an Oath obliges.

D. *But say what you will, we are a people very tender of Oaths.*

I. Every Christian ought to be so, ought to consider well before he come under an Oath; and be well advised before he think himself discharged of that Bond, after he is come under it. But to think a man can not at all be discharged of an Oath about a matter in it self not necessary; is to be more tender then we ought or lawfully can be. You say you are a people very tender of Oaths, how then did the Assembly at *Glasgow*, *Anno* 1638. by their Act loose all the Ministers of the Kingdom, that had entered by the Bishops, from their Oath they had given to the Bishops at their entry to the Mini-

stry? But to come nearer, how was that before Bishops were last restored your selves owned *Commissaries*, though they be expressly named in the *Covenant* as a part of, or Officers depending on the *abjured Hierarchy*, according to your own sense: And if the *Bishops* of this Church be there abjured, so are the *Commissaries*.

D. Commissaries *then had no dependance on* Bishops, *and therefore might be owned as not contrary to the* Covenant.

I. Upon that ground you might have owned a *Dean* too, and said that then having no actual dependance on the *Bishop* the owning of him was not contrary to *Covenant*: yea or owned a *Bishop* too, and said, he had no dependance then on an *Arch-Bishop*, for I can not see why any of those other Members of the *Hierarchy* under the highest, might not have been owned and retained as well as the *Comissary*. 2. Do you not by this answer of yours come near to what I before told you from the *English* Divines, *viz.* that all kind of *Prelacy* is not abjured in the second Article of the *League*, but only that species or complex frame that consists of all the members there mentioned. But,

3. What

What can you say for your owning *Commissaries* now, when again actually they do depend upon *Bishops*? I know none of you who at this day scruples or declines the *Commissaries* Authority and Courts, though actually they do depend upon *Bishops*. Yet give me leave, I think according to your principles, ye ought to disown and decline them: otherwise I shall be glade to learn of you how you free your selves of *Perjury*. And if ye can acknowledge a *Commissary* notwithstanding the *Covenant*, pray, give me your reason, why not a *Bishop* too? But I have yet another breach of Oath to charge you with, which ye give me but too just ground for, and that is, *Schism*, which is both a grievous sin in it self and also expresly abjured in that same second Article of the *League*: And yet ye have been, and still are carrying on a fearful and stated *Schism*, whereby this poor Church is robbed of that Peace and Unity, which our Lord Christ bequeathed to her in Legacy: and this ye do with the greatest activity imaginable, as if you were about some unquestionable duty. But because I can stay no longer with

you at present, I shall be content to speak more of this at our next meeting. So praying the Lord to give you understanding in all things, I bid you farewell.

THE

THE THIRD DIALOGUE

Anent Separation.

Doub. *AT our last meeting our conference was anent the Obligation of the Covenants, with breach whereof we use to charge you: And at parting, you by way of Re-crimination charged us with Schism, which indeed is both a sin in itself, and also expresly abjured in the second Article of the League, But I hope we be not guilty of it.*

I. Schism is a very grievous evil indeed; even a renting of the Body of Christ, which is his Church. An evil, which the Apostle sets himself much against, *Rom.* 16. *vers.* 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 1. *vers.* 12, 13. &c. and *Chap.* 3. *Eph.* 4. *vers.* 3, 4, 5. &c. *Phil.* 2. *vers.* 1, 2, 3. and in other places. An ill that Satan be-

begau to make use of as one of his main engines against the Church, even in the Apostles times, and in sundry ages since. An ill, which sundry of the Fathers of the Church have in their Generations withstood, and given testimony against. *Cyprian* is full to this purpose in his Book, *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, where among other things, he saith, *An secum esse Christum, cum collecti fuerunt, opinantur: qui extra Christi Ecclesiam colliguntur?* *Tales etiamsi occisi fuerint in confessione nominis, Macula ista nec sanguine abluitur, in expiabile & grave culpa discordiæ nec passione purgatur.* *Esse Martyr non potest, qui in Ecclesia non est.* *Ad regnum pervenire non poterit, qui eam, quæ regnatura est, deseruit.* *Pacem vobis Christus dedit, Concordes atq; unanimes esse præcepit, dilectiones & charitatis fœdera inviolata servare mandavit.* *exhibere se non potest Martyrem, qui fraternam non tenuit charitatem.* Ita Paulus, 1 Cor. 13. *Etsi habuero fidem, charitatem autem non habeam, nihil sum.* That is, "Do those, who gather themselves together without the Church, "think Christ is with them so gathered? "such though they were even slain in

con-

"confessing his Name, yet that blot "(Schism) is not washen away with their "bloud, the inexpiable sin of discord "is not purged by their suffering. He "cannot be a Martyr, who is not in the "Church: He cannot come to the King-"dom, who forsakes her (the Church) "that is to reign Christ left and comman-"ded us peace, and that we keep invio-"lable the bonds of Charity, &c. And much more to this purpose that Father hath in the foresaid Book. *Jerome* saith, *Nullum Schisma est, nisi sibi aliquam Hæresin confingat, ut recte ab Ecclesia recessisse videatur.* Where he shews that Schism and Heresie, at least something like it uses to go together. And *Epist. ad Pammachium*, *Quis scindit Ecclesiam, nos quorum omnis domus Bethlehem in Ecclesia communicat, an tu, qui aut bene credis & superbe de fide taces, aut male & vere scindis Ecclesiam?* That is, "Who rents the "Church, we who communicat in the "Church, or you who believing well, "proudly holds thy peace: or believing "ill, truly rents the Church. Where he seemeth to say, That even he who holds his peace, and declares not against

Schism, is guilty of *Schism* too. *Augustin Tract. 27. in Joannem, Anima tua non vivificat, nisi membra quæ sunt in corpore tua*, &c. *Hæc dicuntur ut amemus unitatem & timeamus separationem: Nihil enim debet sic formidare Christianus, quam separari a corpore Christi: Sic enim non est membrum ejus nec vegetatur Spiritu ejus.* Where he shews, That *Separatists* are like members cut off from the body, and so can receive no life from the soul, that quickens the body. The Church is like the Lilly among Thorns, *Cant. 2. 2.* And *Schism* is one of those *Thorns*, and the harder to be pulled out, because *Schismaticks* have always looked on themselves as the only men, and Christians of the first Magnitude, and so do ye, and I am heartily sorry ye give me such ground to charge you with this sin.

D. *Every* Separation *is not a sinful* Schism.

I. True, every *Separation* is not a *Schism*, as the word, *Schism*, is ordinarily taken to signifie a *causeless separating*. For Protestants justifie their separating from the Church of *Rome*, since they could

could not hold Communion with her without sin: That Church being idolatrous in her Worship, and in Doctrine, erronious even to the perverting of Fundamentals by consequence at least, as Protestant Divines shew. But I think you guilty of a sinful *Separation*, which is *Schism*: and that als groundless and unreasonable as any you shall read of in any age of the Church.

D. *Wherein are we guilty of* Schism?

I. *First*, in your dividing from us in that Christian Charity which ye owe unto us, which I may call *Heart-schism*, and is the ground of your external *Schisms*, in dividing from us in Acts of Religious Worship. Ye are a people (at least many of you) who make difference in judgement about matters only of a secondary nature, such as the outward Policy or Government of the Church, a ground for difference in affection, and uncharitableness; as if such who are not of your way and perswasion in these matters could not be real Christians with your selves: And thus you put disputable points of lesser concernment into your Creed: And many of you can with

great freedom un-same all who are not of your opinion in these things: And so ye Un-church and condemn all Christians that have been in all ages almost, and places of the World since Christs time; who ye will find have owned *Bishops*, yea, and *Liturgies*, *Festival-days*, and other Ceremonies, &c. And with whom therefore ye would have taken more ground to quarrel than with us; and if ye be come the length to think the removing of these things necessary to make a true Church (as may be some of you are) then according to you there hath not been a true Church in the World for much above a thousand years together, if according to your own calculation we begin but to reckon from the second or third Century downward.

D. *You cannot deny that many things crept into the Church, that were not from the beginning, or of Christs and his Apostles institution, and such are these things you have named.*

I. That all these things named have crept into the Church, as you say, since the Apostles times, will not be granted.

You

You know *Bishops* are said to have been even from the Apostles times. And *Eusebius*, *Hist. lib. 5. cap. 22.* says, that in the debate about the time of keeping of *Easter* betwixt *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, *Polycrates* alledgeth the Apostle *John's* authority and practice for himself in that matter. But suppone it were granted to you that these things are of later date than the Apostles, will you thence infer, that those who used them could be no good Christians, or that you can not allow them your Charity. Know you not that there may be many things used about the ordering of Gods House, and his Worship, which in themselves are indifferent, neither commanded nor forbidden, and therefore the Church as she seeth fit, may use her Christian liberty about such things. I pray you, consider *Rom. Chap.* 14. There was a great debate among those first Christians anent the use of the Ceremonial Law, and albeit such as thought they were now no more bound by that Law, having purchased their liberty by Christ, and therefore neither regarded one day, nor one

kind

kind of meat above another, were in the right; yet *Paul* commands them to bear with the infirmities of the weak and not despise them, but still account them brethren, and retain Charity, notwithstanding of their error. The weak again were much like your selves, very ready to judge the strong, and to be uncharitable to them: This the Apostle forbiddeth, *Who art thou who judgest another mans Servant*, verf. 4? *Socrates* in his *Church History, lib. 5. cap. 22.* Tells what diversity of customs was among Christians in those first times, and yet no uncharitable judging of one another, as ye use. How justly and severely was *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* blamed by *Irenæus* for his rash uncharitable zeal, much like your own, in excommunicating all the Eastern Churches, because they did not keep *Easter* on that day that he did. Though *Irenæus* was of *Victors* judgement about the thing in debate, yet he much discommended his uncharitable behavior toward *Polycrates* and the *Asian* Churches. *Euseb. lib. 5. Cap. 23.* Now as ye are guilty of heart *Schism*, which is uncharitableness, so expresly forbidden in many

ny Scriptures, especially in 1 *Cor.* 13. *Chap.* throughout. So ye are guilty of *External Schism*; in separating from our Church-communion in the Word, and Sacraments, and all other duties of Religious Worship, contrary to the Apostles Direction, *Heb.* 10. 25. *Forsake not the assembling of your selves together, as the manner of some is.* It seems there were some *Separatists* even at that time, who being misled by a misinformed Judgement, or by pride and singularity, (as *Calvin* noteth on the place) did forsake the ordinary and orderly Assemblies of Christians. It is a received Maxim among Divines, *Opinionem varietas & Opinantium unitas, non sunt adversa.* That is, Variety of Opinions about matters of a secondary Nature and Unity among those who vary in such Opinions, may well consist together.

D. *All of us do not altogether forsake your Assemblies, some do but now and then leave their own* Parish *Churches.*

I. Indeed ye are not all guilty of *Separation* in the same degree, yet the least degree is unwarrantable and ought to be avoided. It may be observed how people

ple turn not *Separatists* of the highest degree at first, but proceed from step to step: First they begin to withdraw sometimes from their own Congregation, then they come to withdraw more ordinarily, and at length altogether: Some when they withdraw from their own Parish, will not go hear, ordinarily at least, such as are discharged by Law, but some other Minister who either preaches under the Government, or is indulged by the King and his Council: and within a little, will hear none of them. Some will hear, but not partake of the Sacraments in their own Congregation, and so acknowledges their Ministry in one part of his Office, but not in another: Upon what grounds they do so, I confess I am not able to understand; for I hope they disclaim the Popish error, that *the Efficacy of the Sacraments depend upon the intention of the Minister.* Now I say, an advised Christian will do well to take heed, and beware of any the least degree of Separation, both because unwarrantable in it self, and because it maketh way for a further degree, and that second for a third, and so

unfixt people may take a running, that they shall not know where to make a stand. Have we not seen some turn at length *Brownists*, and some *Quakers*: yea, Mr. *Baxter* in his *Cure of Church Divisions*, *Pag.* 268. tells of some in *England* who turning *Separatists*, at length died Apostat *Infidels*, deriding Christianity, and the imortality of the soul.

D. *There are among your selves who will not be constant and ordinary hearers in their own Congregations, What say you of them?*

I. I say, such are very reprovable, for doing that which hath in it the seeds of greater *Schism*. And those Ministers though conform, to whom people of anothers charge, use to resort, are bound to declare against it, unless great distance of place from their own Paroch Church, or other insuperable let hinder their ordinar frequenting of their own Congregation, and their absence be not grounded upon any disrespect unto, or disesteem of their own Minister: Otherwise, I say, that Minister to whom they come is bound to declare against such practices:

ſtices: And if he do not, it's preſum'd, deſire of applauſe, and ſelf-love makes him hold his peace, and prevails more with him, than love to the peace and unity of the Church.

D. *It's very hard to hinder me from going where I can be moſt edified, we are bidden covet the beſt Gifts*, 1 Cor. 12. verſ. laſt. *And a man may go where he can have the beſt dinner.*

I. I hear that uſeth to be your language: as for that place, 1 *Cor.* 12. *laſt*, The Apoſtle is not directing private Chriſtians what Gifts in others to ſeek after for their edification: but ſhews that though there are diverſities of Gifts, and every one ſhould be content with his own Gif given him for the edification of others, yet ſo that he ſeek after better, not in others but in himſelf. 2. The Apoſtle in that *Chapter* is clearly preſſing the *Corinthians* to Unity, from the conſideration that Chriſtians are all one body; and therefore the meaneſt Gifts muſt no more be deſpiſed than the meaneſt members of our body; and *Schiſm* muſt be avoided, *verſ.* 25. 3. Suppone coveting the beſt Gifts were ſpoken to Chriſtians,

in

in your ſenſe, yet it muſt be underſtood with due Limitations, ſuch as that we covet them in an orderly way, and with reſpect to the Churches peace, and ſuch like. And ſo many general directions in the Word, are to be underſtood with neceſſary cautions, as your ſelf can not deney. Edification indeed is much to be ſet by, yet let none imagine that it is warrantable for them to ſeek it in a way that marrs the Churches peace, breeds in people a neglect and deſpiſing of their own Miniſters, who are ſet over them in the Lord, and whom they are commanded to honour and reverence; that takes away the diſtinction of Parochs, and of one mans labours from another; as we would ſhun confuſion; And that is contrary to laudable *Canons*, and Acts of the Church. You know *we muſt not do evil that good may come of it*, Rom. 3. 8.

D. *What*, Canons *or* Acts *of the Church are againſt my leaving my own* Paroch Miniſter, *and going to another, by whom I think I get more good?*

I. I might produce ſundry ancient *Canons* commanding Miniſters not to exciſe

exciſe their Paſtoral Office within another's charge without leave, and that they receive not any man of another Paroch to Divine Service who neglects his own Paſtor. The Firſt Council of *Nice*, *Can.* 16. The ſecond *Council of Carthage*, *Can.* 11. and *Council* 3. *Can.* 20. *Concilium Nannetenſe*, *cap.* 1. In which *Council* Preſbyters or Miniſters are commanded that at their entry to Divine Service they ask the people if there be any preſent of anothers Congregation, who deſpiſing his own Miniſter deſires to joyn with them, and if any ſuch be found, that forthwith he be thruſt out of the Church. And again in that ſame *Council*, that *no miniſter reſet one that belongs to anothers charge, unleſs he be on a journey, or upon ſome other ſuch relevant ground that keeps him from attending in his own congregation for the time.* But paſſing theſe, there is an act of the General Aſſembly of this ſame Church of *Scotland*, *Anno* 1647. To be found among the printed Acts of it, Intituled, *Act againſt ſuch as withdraw themſelves from the publick Worſhip in their own Congregation*; And it is expreſs in diſcharging all Members of

this

this Kirk from withdrawing from their own Congregation usually, except in urgent cases made known unto, and approven by the *Presbytrie*: And if any contraveen, it's recommended first to the Minister, to whom such persons resort, to deal with them to stay at home in their own *Paroch*; And then to the Minister and Session of the *Paroch* they belong to; and if need be to cite them to the *Presbytrie*, &c. Now, I suppose you will not decline the Authority of that Assembly, nor think the General Assembly of this Church were such enemies to edification, as to have deprived Christians of this way of attaining it, if they might have allowed it to them without manifest hazard of *Schism*. You may think they were competent enough to judge in such a case; yea, that Act was purposely conceived to curb the beginnings of *Separation*, and *Schism*, which at that time began to appear in this Church.

D. *If Ministers had all alike abilities, and gifts, for edification, I could say the less against that Act: but it is not so, for some Ministers excell others very far in an edifying gift.*

I. Yet

I. Yet you see what the Assemblies mind was in this matter. Now to what you say of an edifying Gift, I wish many of you mistake it not, if a man have a stentorian voice, or a ton, can speak loud and boldly, and can rail upon the Civil Powers, and cry down *Bishops*, and *Curats*: O, *that is an edifying man*! It feareth me, many of you who are pretenders high enough to knowledge, and piety, can little judge of mens Gifts when all is done: and I make no doubt, oft times leaves better at home then what ye go to. But passing this, I offer to your serious consideration these few things anent the diverse measures of Ministerial Gifts, and Edification by them. 1. The Lord hath not given to all Ministers alike measure of Gifts, but the Spirit distributes in what measure he pleaseth, 1 *Cor.* 12. and therefore to undervalue men of low Gifts, is to quarrel with the Almighty. 2. Though all have not received alike measure, we must not therefore think the meanest Gifts are useless, 1 *Cor.* 12. *vers.* 21. 25. 3. The best Gifts can not of themselves work on hearts and consciences, it's only the Spirit can do this by what means

pleaseth,

pleaseteh him, weak or strong, 1 *Cor.* 3. *vers.* 6, 7. And therefore peoples too much magnifying of Gifts is but an idolizing of men, and giving Gods due to the Creature, this seems to have been the fault of the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor. chap.* 1. and *chap.* 3. The learned *Hieronimus Zanchius* in the *Epistle Dedicatory to the seventh* Tom. *of his Works*, tells, that when first he left *Italy*, he came to *Geneve*, and there observing a *French* man who used always to hear *Calvin*, and none else, he asked him his reason why he did not hear *Viretus* as occasion served, he answered, that if *Paul* were to come and preach at *Geneve*, *Ego relicto Paulo, audirem Calvinum*, i. e. he would leave *Paul* and go hear *Calvin*; which answer amazed *Zanchius*, and saith that he heard him, *cum summa animi offensione*, i. e. *Zanchius* was much troubled and offended at his answer, and observeth from it, how dangerous it is for people to admire any Minister too much, and make gods of them, as he saith, and to despise others. 4. The Lord useth oft-times to do more good by men of weak Gifts, than by greater. *Christ* was very far beyond *Peter*

in

in Gifts, for *he received not the Spirit by measure*, and his enemies did bear him witness, that *never man spake like him*. And in another place, *They wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth*; And yet *Act.* 2. Peter a poor sinful man, and very weakly gifted in comparison of Christ, at one Sermon converteth three thousand. We read no where of the like success of Christs Ministry, but we hear him oft complaining of small success, as was before propheſied, *Isai* 49. *vers.* 4. and *Chap.* 53. *vers.* 1, 2, 3. &c. And in the Gospel frequently upbraiding these to whom he had preached, because of their unbelief, *Math.* 11. *vers.* 20, 21, 22, 23. &c. *Chap.* 13. *vers.* 14, 15. &c. *Chap.* 23. *vers.* 37. *John.* 5. *vers.* 40. and in other places. And in that famous Sermon he had on the Mount, *Mat.* 5. 6, 7. It's said *Chap. vers.* 28. that when he had ended his Sermon, *the people were astonished*, but not a word that many were converted, but ground for the contrary, from *Chap.* 8. *vers.* 10, 11, 12. where commending the *Centurion's* faith, he saith to the multitude that followed him down from the Mount, That many should

come from the *East and West* and ſit down with *Abraham*, &c. And the unbelieving *Jews*, who were the children of the kingdom, ſhould be caſt out. Therefore, I ſay, if people would in one orderly way, attend the Ordinances in their own congregations, and would lay aſide prejudices, and pray that the Gifts of their own Miniſters may be bleſſed to them; they might expect it ſhould not be in vain, 2 *Cor.* 4. 7. *We have this treaſure in earthen veſſels that the excellency*, &c. And ſurely the more weak and inſufficient the Inſtrument is, the more is his Omnipotency conſpicuous, and his Arm revealed in doing good by weak means. Ponder theſe things well, which you will find do little favour your *Separation* upon pretence of being edifyed.

D. *Though ſome withdraw, all will not.*

I. The fewer the better: yet if you withdraw, why may not others, and if ſome, why not all? for it is natural to people to be led by ill example. And if all withdraw, we ſhall have Paſtors without Flocks: and is it not by your means almoſt come to this already in ſundry places; but, as I have ſhown, none ought to withdraw.

D. *None*

D. *None ought to withdraw! that is ſtrange. What obligation lyeth on me to be an ordinary hearer in my own Congregation?*

I. I ſpake ſomewhat before of the obligation we are under to maintain the Churches Peace, and of the *Acts* of the Church in ancient times, and in our own times to this purpoſe. And now further, do you not know that there is a reciprocal obligation betwixt a Miniſter and his People, which can not be ſo eaſily broken as you imagine. As the Miniſter is oblieged to labour among the people of his charge, diligently and faithfully, and that upon his peril, *Ezek.* 33. *verſ.* 8. *Heb.* 13. *verſ.* 17. So the people of his charge are bound to attend on his Miniſtry among them. To eſteem him highly, and love him for his Works ſake, *Mal.* 2. *verſ.* 7. 1 *Theſ.* 5. *verſ.* 11, 12. To obey him, *Heb.* 13. *verſ.* 17. Now how obey ye theſe injunctions when ye turn your backs upon your Miniſters, will not receive the Law from their mouth, but do undervalue, deſpiſe, diſcountenance, diſcourage, and weaken their hands by this your contempt, and

by

your reproaches too, which oft ye are pleased to cast upon them? Do ye not fear what Christ hath said, *He that despiseth you despiseth me*? Hear I pray you what Mr. *Durham* (whose testimony I think ye ought to regard) saith, he speaking of a Ministers relation to a particular Congregation, on *Revel.* Pag. 105, 106. After he hath shewed that there is warrant from those *Epistles* directed to the *Angels* of the seven Churches, for a more special relation betwixt a *Minister* and such a *Flock*, rather than another *Flock*, and betwixt a *Flock* and such a *Minister*, rather than another *Minister*: for the *Angel* of *Ephesus* was not the *Angel* of *Smyrna*, nor yet the Church of *Ephesus* equally bound to the *Angel* of *Smyrna*, as to the *Angel of Ephesus*, he saith, *Upon this delegation by the master, such a people became peculiarly the people of such a* Minister, *and by the Masters appointment are to submit to the Ordinances administred by him; because that same Lord and Master of the Minister who warrands him peculiarly to treat with such a* people, *being also Master of that Flock; calleth them peculiarly to sub-*

mit to that Minister from which, according to his appointment there ariseth a mutual obligation betwixt such a Minister *and such a* people; *he is bound to Minister to them in the Gospel, and they are bound to submit to him, strengthen him, acknowledge him, communicate to him in all good things,* &c. And further, he there shews, that this Obligation is not founded *upon meer voluntar consent, but on these* Scripture *commands,* 1 *Thes.* 5. *vers.* 12. *Heb.* 13. *vers.* 17. *Galat.* 6. *vers.* 6. and the like; although there be no explicite covenanting betwixt a *Minister* and a *People* in reference to these ends. And, *pag.* 106. he saith, *From this mutual obligation there ariseth a nearer sympathy betwixt that Minister and People, than betwixt him and any other People, and betwixt them and that Minister, than betwixt them and any other Minister: They have common interests, common hazards, common joy and grief: and a cross to one should be to both. And a little after he addeth, that there are peculiar duties called for on both sides to each other, which are not so required betwixt them and others; and that there will be a peculiar reckoning that will follow hereupon;*

As-

the Minister must reckon for his People, the People for their reverencing, and incouraging of him in a special manner: And that this account Paul *did aggredge particularly the* Gentiles, *their slighting and grieving of him, in his Epistles to the* Corinthians, and *Galatians*; *Because of his particular delegation in reference to them.* Thus Mr. *Durham*, who, you see, speaks home to this point, and upon Scripture grounds binds you faster to the Ministers of your own Congregations, than you are aware.

D. *But there are other reasons that keep back many of us, why we cannot have freedom to hear and own the Ministers of the time, were they never so able to edifie.*

I. What are these Reasons?

D. First, *They have not entered by a call from the People, as all Ministers should do*, Act. 14. vers. 23. *But by a Presentation from some Patron.*

I. Sundry of those whom ye refuse to hear, entered by the peoples call, and such ye ought to hear, notwithstanding this reason of yours. As to that place, Act. 14. 23. I know many have pleaded the peoples right to Elect their own Mi-

niſter from the Greek word χειροτονησας there uſed, which is borrowed from the Cuſtome uſed in ſome of the ancient Greek States, where the people ſignified their Election of their Magiſtrates, by the ſtretching forth of their hands, for ſo the word ſignifieth. But that place *Act.* 14. and the word as it is there uſed will not neceſſarily import the people's choicing of their own Miniſters: For 1. Some learned Interpreters, and Criticks on that place, among whom eſpecially, ſee *Hammond*, ſhews that the word is often uſed by Writers, to expreſs the action of one ſingle perſon, and thus it is uſed by the ſame *Lut*, *Act.* 10. 41. Speaking of Gods choicing or appointing: So that the word is not neceſſarily to be underſtood of the action or deed of many, choicing by ſuffrages or voices. 2. It is obſerved that the Greek Writers ordinarily uſed this word to ſignifie the ordaining of a perſon to a certain charge, which is done without ſuffrages, or choicing by votes. And that ſo it muſt be taken here, appears from this, becauſe it is *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who are ſaid to do this work expreſſed here

by the Greek word, and not the people. Now you will not say, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* did elect Ministers to these Churches, that were to yield the question: Therefore in our Translation it is said, when they, that is, *Paul* and *Barnabas* had ordained them Elders in every Church, they prayed and commended them to the Lord. Now all these were the actions of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, not of the people. And, 3. If you mean by this Word, the peoples electing Ministers by suffrages, you lose by it, and gives great advantage to Independents, who are for popular elections of Ministers: Whereas ye give this power, not to all the people, but to the *Session*: And therefore observing Presbyterians have forborn to press this place, as you expound it. But, 2. If you think the Ministers election either by People or Session essential, that is, so necessary to make one a Minister to such a people, that he cannot be their Minister without it, you by this do not only nullify the Ministry of almost the whole Christian World for above a thousand years upward, but also in particular, the Ministry of this

Church of *Scotland*, ever until the year 1649. for not till then were *Patronages* taken away, and the election by *Sessions* brought in use. Now what thanks will you get for this, even from many of your selves? For not only were all the Protestant Ministers before the year 1638. entered by Presentations, but also all the Presbyterian Ministers after the year, 1638. till the year 1649. And there are some of them still in Office at this day in the same Congregations, to which they entered, not by the Sessions election, but by the Patrons Presentation: yet I think none of you will scruple to hear or own them upon that account, nor ever did.

D. But I look upon Patronages *as a corruption abjured in the Covenant.*

I. I pray you let me see in what place. And further, if *Presentations* and *Patronages* be abjured, how came it to pass that this Kirk did continue so long under Perjury? For from the first taking of the Covenant, till the year 1649, Patronages were still in use. And it's strange if all that while this breach of Covenant was not discerned. And I told you presently your selves do without scruple

hear Ministers of your own perswasion, who entered by Presentations from Patrons.

D. *Many of your Ministers are ordained by Bishops, and this is another reason why we cannot hear them.*

I. Yet all the Ministers whom ye refuse to hear were not ordained by Bishops, even all who were ordained betwixt the year 1638. and 1662. or thereby, and there are very many of these at this day in this Church, whom ye will not hear, though they were ordained by a *Presbytrie* without a *Bishop*. As for your not hearing of such as received Ordination from a Bishop, ye would for the same reason have refused to hear those ministers whom *Timothy* ordained in *Ephesus*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. or whom *Titus* ordained in *Crete*, *Tit.* 1. 5. You may see what *Calvin* saith on the place. And ye would have refused to hear any Minister in the World for many hundreds of years together, for all were ordained by Bishops. It was early said in the Church, *Quid facit Episcopus quod non facit Presbyter, excepta Ordinatione.* Ordination, then was accounted the pro-

per act of the Bishop, and now Bishops ordain not without the concurrence of Ministers, who also have a hand in that action. And by this reason of yours ye would have refused to hear those Ministers who were the Members of the Assembly of *Glasgow*, 1638. For though they voted down the Bishops, yet all of them generally had been ordained by Bishops, few or none excepted, and had sworn obedience to them too. And further, by this reason ye should refuse to hear some at this day, who though they do not conform now to Episcopacy: yet were ordained by Bishops before the year 1638. and without scruple ye can hear such of the validity of Ordination by Bishops, see at length the *London* Presbyterians in their *Jus Divinum Ministerij Anglicani*, from Pag. 17. especially from *pag.* 25. to *pag.* 32. or further if you will to *pag.* 49.

D. *Though many of the Ministers of the time were ordained by Presbytrie without a Bishop, yet now they are turned* Curats, *no less than such as are ordained by the Bishops, and we can hear none who preach under Bishops, what ever way they were ordained,*

damned, they are now all of them the Bishops Curats.

I. By your calling Ministers, *Curats*, I know not whither ye manifest more strength of passion or weakness of judgement. For as all ye who use that word, useth to express your spleen and disdain; not fearing Christs word, *he that despiseth you despiseth me*: So there be very few among you who know what the word, *Curate*, signifieth: And even those who know that it signifieth one who hath, *Curam animarum*, the care of souls (a name no Minister needs be ashamed of, but should strive to be in some measure answerable to it) yet I suppose, know not well, many of them, how, or in what sense it hath been used, else they would not so ignorantly misapply it: For those use to be called, *Curats*, who serve the Cure, as they speak, though they be not the Ministers who are presented to the place, but substituted by them to officiat in their room, and hence are called, *Curats*, the presented Minister being none resident. Now it is not so in this Church. But because ye call a Minister the Bishops *Curate*, ye seem to run

upon another mistake, as if the Bishop were, or did assume to himself to be the sole and proper Pastor of the whole Diocess; and Ministers were but his substitutes, deputed under him, as so many helpers. I know no Bishop who hath such thoughts of himself, or of Ministers, what ever ye think or say to cast an *odium* upon them. But why can ye not hear them who preach under the Bishops Government?

D. *They are* perjured *persons, and therefore we cannot hear them?*

I. All who preach under the present Government, yea, I suppose the most part of them, never took the Covenant, and therefore are not to be called *perjured*. For I told you at our last conference, the Covenant, as such cannot bind them who never took it, and so such Ministers may be heard, notwithstanding of this reason, and even those Ministers who took the Covenant, and now upon this alteration continue in their Ministry under Bishops, are not perjured (suppose our Episcopacy be meant in the Covenant) for the reasons I gave you at our last communing. An Oath made a-

gainst

gainſt a thing in it ſelf not unlawful, can not bind abſolutely or in every caſe; therefore when it's taken, is neceſſarily to be underſtood with certain limitations and reſtrictions; otherwiſe it may come to be a bond of iniquity, as this Oath, may be, is to many through their miſtake hereof. But giving though not granting, that all the Miniſters who took the Covenant, and now preach under Biſhops, are perjured, it will be hard for you to prove, That therefore they are not to be owned as truly Miniſters of the Goſpel, nor ſubmitted to. It is true, perſonal faults and vices make a Miniſter juſtly liable to Church cenſure; and if they be of a high ſcandalous nature, to depoſition; eſpecially if he be impenitent in them; But ſo long as he is not convict and cenſured, the queſtion is, whither or not the people may, yea, and ought to wait on his Miniſtry? You know *Judas* was ſent forth to preach with the reſt by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and who will ſay, that it was unwarrantable for any to hear him who came cloathed with ſuch a miſſion and commiſſion from Chriſt, as long as he was not convict, even though

they

they had known what a knave he was, for Christ knew very well what he was. And ye know what great exceptions might have been brought, both against the Life and Doctrine of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, *Mat.* 15. 23. and in other places. They were most bitter active enemies against Christ the *Messiah*, by all means sought to undo him, they neglected the weightie duties of the Law, such as *Mercy*, *Judgement*, and *Faith*, were full of Pride and gross hypocrisie: I will not insist to tell you how *Naphtaly* in a great distemper, miscalls the Ministers of the time very ill: though much were true of what he saith, as God forbid, yet they would be no worse than the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, yea, not so ill; for they did most maliciously oppose Christ Jesus himself, and that directly: neither have I any pleasure to make that parallel betwixt the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and your *Preachers*, ye so much glory of, that some have done, in their *long prayers*, *devouring of widows houses*, *compassing Sea and Land to make Proselits*, &c. They have given but too much ground for these comparisons. But to

our

our purpose, as the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were very gross in their lives, so there was much Leaven in their Doctrine, they brought in a number of humane Traditions into the Doctrine and Worship of God and taught for *Doctrines the commandments of men*, *they took away the Key of Knowledge*, &c. Christ in his Sermon on the Mount, *Mat.* 5. purges the Law from their corrupt glosses: and yet for all this, *Simeon* and *Anna*, two old Saints, did not forsake the Temple, *Luk.* 2. Nor turned *Separatists*, though it was turned into a den of thieves. *Joseph* and *Mary* went up yearly to the Temple to keep the *Passover*, and Christ himself went with them at twelve years of age. And *Mat.* 23. He biddeth hear the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* who sat in *Moses* Chair, notwithstanding their bad lives, and corrupt Doctrines, only he gives a *Caveat*, to bewar of their Leaven, and their ill example: Read Mr. *Durham* on *Revel. Chap.* 3. Commenting on the Epistle to the Angel of *Sardis*, who had a *name that he lived, but was dead*, *Pag.* 187. He saith, that comparing that Angel with him of

Laodicea,

Laodicea, *There is ground to say that men who are for their own case unsound, may yet be Ministers in the Church of Christ, and ought to be esteemed so, while they continue in that room; seing Christ doth so here.* And again, saith, *The Ordinance of Christ ought not to suffer derogation in whatsoever hands it be; And that hence the Lord recommends to his hearers to give due Ministerial respect to the Scribes and Pharisees,* Mat. 23. *Even when he is about to discover their rottenness, and that* Judas *was by the people to be accounted an Ambassadour of Christ with the rest, because it is not grace that intituleth one to that charge, but Christs Call and Commission; And seing a call may be separated from grace, as grace from a call, it will follow, that according to his Soveraignity he may make use of whom he will, he may make use of men even more sinful than others, that it may be known that edifying of souls doth not necessarily depend on the holiness of the Instrument,* Act. 3. 12. Mat. 7. 23. Thus Mr. *Durham.* Now how can you justifie your *Separation,* when you dare not with any face say the Ministers of the time are as corrupt as were the *Scribes* and *Pharisees,* if there be

be any other knowledge or moderation in you. And ſuppoſe you think them as bad, yet they are to be heard, as theſe were, read the *London* Miniſters, their *Jus Divinum Miniſt. Anglic.* pag. 2.

D. *Chriſt*, Math. 23. verſ. 1, 2. *Biddeth not hear the* Scribes *and* Phariſees, *the words will not bear that.*

I. I hope ye will not ſay that he forbiddeth to hear them, as ye uſe to forbid people to hear among us: a thing your Preachers are much on, as a ready way to gain followers to themſelves. It's ſaid, ſome of them are ſo far tranſported as to threaten people with damnation if they hear the *Curats* (ſo they call Miniſters) how true this is, I will not poſitively ſay, the matter reported being ſo groſs, renders it hardly credible: What truth may be in it you know better than I. You ſay *Chriſt biddeth not hear the Scribes and Phariſees*; yet I told you, Mr. *Durham* ſaith, Chriſt there recommends to the people to give due Miniſterial reſpect to the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*: Now is not hearing of them a part of *due miniſterial reſpect*, think you?

Cer-

Certainly without this their *ministerial respect* should be very lame. Christ biddeth the people observe and do what the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* from *Moses* Chair enjoyned them to observe and do, and how could they obey Christs injunction in this, unless they heard the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* teach them those things from *Moses* Chair. He that biddeth me obey my Ministers Doctrine delivered to me from the Word of God, his injunction carrieth also in it, an injunction to hear the Minister deliver those Doctrins to me, or presuppoſeth my hearing as the ordinary mean, or antecedent of my obedience. Be pleased to consult Interpreters on the place, and you will find them generally expounding that place, both of hearing and obeying. And truly it is too clear a Scripture for you to elude, but will stand against you to your great conviction. *Brounists* and such like *Separatists* in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, and since, found the dint of it from the old non-conformists, who disputed against their dividing practices, which ye so much follow.

D. *It may be so. Yet many Episcopal Ministers*

niſters have entered in upon honeſt mens labours: and for this reaſon ought not to be heard, but diſcountenanced as Intruders.

I All the Epiſcopal Miniſters entered not ſo, very many of them kept ſtill the places the change of Government found them in: Others entered unto Churches upon the vacancies by the death of thoſe who had been there before, or upon their tranſportation to ſome other Church. You muſt confeſs this reaſon ſayeth nothing againſt any of thoſe. Yet you ſay, *many Epiſcopal Miniſters did intrude themſelves upon other mens labours.* If hereby you mean a *ſinful intruſion*, as I know you do, let me ask you, firſt, were theſe Miniſters whom you charge with *Intruſion* active in outing their Predeceſſors, or did they come in upon their places till they were out, and their places declared vacant? 2. Would you, or would theſe Miniſters who were not clear to keep their places on the terms of the change, but choſed rather to ſtep out, have the people of ſuch Congregations left without a ſettled Miniſtrie, becauſe they were not clear to brook

it

it themſelves? Is this all their kindneſs to their people, or looks it not rather like a piece of petted ſelf, that will neither do nor let do? And what you talk of coming in upon other mens labours, is as applicable to one that cometh in upon a Miniſters charge, who againſt his will is tranſported to another charge, by thoſe who have power to diſpoſe of him: The Miniſter ſo tranſported, may be, thinketh there is a wrong done both to him, and to the people he is taken from, and the people think ſo too; and poſſibly it is ſo: yet he who ſucceedeth him upon an orderly and fair call, you know, cannot be ſaid to be an *intruder*, or in your ſenſe, to come in upon another mans labours. I think an injury, ſuppoſe really done to the former Miniſter, by thoſe who put him to the door, ought not hinder well adviſed people from ſubmitting to another, for there is a neceſſity of a Miniſtrie, and knowing conſciencious Chriſtians ſhould make the beſt of what they can not help in their Superiours. And if they cannot get ſuch a Miniſter as they would, ought to take ſuch as they can have

have. Theſe Miniſters who were put from their charges, for aſſerting their duty to the King in the year 1648. had far better ground to complain that others were brought in upon their labours: yet they were ſilent and ſubmiſſive, nor did they ſtir up the people to diſcountenance ſuch as ſucceeded in their places: and if the people had withdrawn, and refuſed to hear them that ſucceeded, as *Intruders*, as people are taught now to do, without doubt, the *Judicatours* at that time would have noticed them ſeverely. But *Laſtly*, ye who make ſo great a clamour of coming in upon other mens labours, what think ye of your own Preachers who go up and down from Paroch to Paroch through the Countrey, and any one of them will intrude himſelf not upon one Miniſters charge only, but, in ſo far as he can, upon the charges and labours of all the Miniſters in *Scotland*. Alace, tell us no more of Miniſters among us, who have entered upon other mens labours, they are but petty intruders, that confine themſelves to one Paroch; but theſe among you are intruders indeed, and

and to purpose, *Rom.* 2. 21. When *Alexander* accused one that he was a *Pirate*, he answered, I am but a petty one, but you are the great *Pirate* that makes prey of whole Kingdomes and Nations.

D. *We are sworn by the Covenant to extirpat all that depend upon the Hierarchy, of which number the Episcopal Ministers are: and therefore cannot lawfully hear them, without breach of our Oath.*

I. Ministers are not all expreſt in that Article: but suppose they were meant, yet it's said, *All Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy*, that is, as I told you at our last conference, on that kind of *Hierarchy* that consists and is made up of all these Officers mentioned in the Article, as the *English* Presbyterians sense it, which kind of *Hierarchy* we have not in this Church. But further, if Ministers depending on Bishops be there meant, then ye by binding your selves not to hear them, have bound your selves to sin; for I told you a little before, Ministers may be very faulty, and sinful Creatures, and yet ought to be heard. But besides, I have shown

you

you before that *Epiſcopacy* is a moſt warrantable Government, which neither you nor I, nor any man could ever unwarrantably abjure, nor Miniſters depending on it. So this reaſon of yours will come to nothing. And *Laſtly*, by your expoſition of that Clauſe of the ſecond Article, ye were bound not to hear any Miniſters who were in Office at the time of taking the Covenant, but to root out and extirpat them all, becauſe all theſe Miniſters depended on Biſhops as to their Ordination ſtill, even after they took the Covenant, unleſs they had renounced their Ordination which they received from Biſhops, and had been ordained of new by meer Preſbyters, which they did not, nor thought themſelves bound to do, notwithſtanding of the Covenant, otherwiſe it would follow, that all the time before, they were Miniſters without a true *Ordination*, and ſo what ſhould become of all their Miniſteriall Acts they had performed by vertue of that Ordination they had received from Biſhops: and yet to this day ye never ſcrupled hearing ſuch of them as took the Covenant, not-

notwithstanding of their dependance foresaid, which is still a dependance in part, if they but disown the Bishops Government for the future.

D. *Besides the reasons already named against hearing I have this to add: we are warranted by the Word to separate from a corrupt Church.*

I, If you think Bishops are a corruption in the Church, it will not be granted to you. And then you are mistaken, if you think, that every Church that hath corruption in it, is straight way to be separated from. There may be even great corruption in a Church, and yet Separation from her not lawful. Was there not great corruption of Doctrine in the Church of *Galatia*, and many infected with it? and in the Church of *Corinth*, was there not an Article of the Creed (the Resurrection of the dead) questioned? Yea, by sundrie flatly denied, 1 *Cor.* 15. *Chap.* We read of great faults in sundrie of these Churches, *Rev. Chap.* 2. and *Chap.* 3. And in the Church of the Old Testament sundrie times, read the Books of the *Kings* and the *Chronicles*, and the *Prophets*, and

and you ſhall ſee what great corruptions oft were in that Church, and yet no command to the godly to Separate, as long as the very ſubſtance of the Worſhip was not corrupted, as it was in the caſe of *Jeroboams* Calves, 2 *Chron.* 11. 16. in the firſt ages of the Chriſtian Church, it's known what Cenſures paſt againſt the *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, and others, becauſe they were *Schiſmaticks*, and, may be, there was as great corruptions in the Church at that time as any ye can pretend now, if not greater.

D. *If we may not Separate from a corrupt Church, what then mean theſe Scriptures?* 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 15, 16. 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. 2 *Theſ.* 3. 6. *Rev.* 18. 3.

I. I deny not but a Church may be corrupted in that degree, that Separation from her is warrantable, yea, and neceſſarie. Yet I told you everie corruption is no ſufficient ground of Separating from her. As for theſe Scriptures ye name, they prove not your point. In 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. The Apoſtle is ſpeaking of the dutie of Chriſtians in Separating from Idolaters, and Heathens in their Ido-

Idolatries and ungodlie fellowships, not of withdrawing from Christian Assemblies. In 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. and 2 *Thes.* 3. 6. He tells Christians their dutie, not to keep needless fellowship in their private converse with such as are scandalous, but biddeth them not withdraw from the publick Worship of God, even though there be scandalous persons there; Wicked scandalous persons pollute not the Ordinances to us, nor is their presence at the Ordinances a ground for us to Separate, though it may be the fault of Church guides, if they be careless in keeping them back from such of the Ordinances as they have no right to, *Rev.* 18. 3. is ordinarilie expounded by *Protestants*, of leaving the Idolatrous Worship of the Church of *Rome*, where Doctrine also is much corrupted, but gives no warrant to Separate from a sound Church, where no such corruptions are.

D. *We think we have better reason to charge you with* Schism, *than ye have to charge us; for ye have departed from the Government of this Church by Presbytrie, to which we still adhere: so that ye*

have

have made the Schiſm from us, not we from you.

I. What, little ground ye have to charge us with Schiſm in reſpect of Government, may appear, if ye conſider, 1. That our ſubmitting to the preſent Government by Biſhops, is in obedience to the Commands, of our Superiours, whom both ye and we are bound to obey in things in themſelves not ſinful: So that our ſubmiſſion is dutie, and your non-ſubmiſſion is both diſobedience and Schiſm, diſobedience to Authoritie, Schiſm from the body of the Church. 2. If ye will conſider, that Epiſcopacy (as at ſome length I ſhew in our firſt conference) is the only Government of the Church left by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and practiſed in the firſt and pureſt times after them, and ſo downward: Not we who now ſubmit to this Government are the Schiſmaticks, but ye who refuſe ſubmiſſion to it; hereby ye are guilty of Schiſm from the whole Primitive times, alſwell as from us. But beſides, when we charge you with Schiſm, we mean it not only, nor mainly of Schiſm, in reſpect of Govern-

ment, but of your dividing and ſeparating from our Chriſtian Aſſemblies eſpecially, and Divine Worſhip there performed; which indeed is a great Schiſm, even ſuppoſe there were many things wrong among us, that needed amendment, I pray you conſider, I hope ye will not ſay, we have departed more from you and from the truth, than the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, and the *Jewiſh* Church under them had departed from *Moſes* Law in Chriſts time, and yet neither Chriſt nor the godly at that time, ſuch as *Simeon* and *Anna*, *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth*, *Joſeph* and *Mary*, with many others, thought themſelves oblieged to ſeparate from that Church. Alace, then how will ye be able to juſtifie this Separation of yours?

D. *Your Miniſters Lecture not to the people, therefore we will not hear them.*

I. Some among us did continue to Lecture, but that did not keep the people from the diſeaſe of the time, *Separation.* 2. We have the Scriptures publickly read in the Church, which is a very ancient practice, both in the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Church. The *Jews* had the five Books of

of *Moſes* or *Pentatuch*, which was commonly called the Law; divided into 53. Sections by *Ezra*, as ſome think; and every Sabbath day one of thoſe Sections, together with a part of the Prophets was read in the Synagogues, See *Act.* 13. *verſ.* 15, 27. and *Act.* 15. 21. And that there were Lectures, that is, Readers in the ancient Chriſtian Church, is well known. So that ye who on this ground Separate now, would have ſeparate from the Church in all ages. 3. Lectures as now uſed, have no authority from the Church nor ever had: For they are not according to the firſt appointment, which was, that the Miniſter ſhould read a Chapter in the Old Teſtament, and another in the New, and where any difficult place occurred, briefly give the meaning without any more, but that way was ſoon left, and Miniſters held with one Chapter, and many with a part of one, and not only expounded, but alſo raiſed practical obſervations: ſo that in effect, as ſome have expreſſed it, the Lecture came to be a ſhort Sermon on a long Text: And indeed a Lecture and a Sermon af-

ter it, are two Sermons at one dyet, and they that ſeparate for want of this, would for the ſame reaſon ſeparate from one who uſeth ſhorter Sermons, to another who preacheth longer: And yet long tedious Sermons are judged leſs edifying, *cæteris paribus*, and it may be a queſtion whither it be not fitter for peoples edification to hold them with one Sermon at one dyet, than to give them two, conſidering their forgetfulneſs, when a great variety of purpoſes is accumulat, one thing puts out another: And conſidering their dulneſs, and backwardneſs to receive divine things, and how ſoon corrupt nature will wearie and ſit up, when about theſe exerciſes; is it not ſafer to hold with a few things, and preſs them home at one time? Therefore that ancient Chriſtian *Pembo*, an unlearned man, recorded in Church Hiſtorie, deſiring another to learn him a part of a *Pſalm*, and having heard the firſt *verſe* of the 39. *Pſalm* read, would hear no more, ſaying it was a leſſon great enough at that time, and a long time after that another asked him, if he was yet ready for another

ther leſſon, he anſwered no, for he had not ſufficiently learned his firſt leſſon. 4. Suppoſe our want of Lectures were a fault, yet I told you every fault or neglect in a Church is not a ground to Separate from her. And know you not, that the ancient *Jewiſh* Church ſome times wanted Ordinances even of Divine Inſtitution, and that for a long time together, as *Circumciſion*, the *Paſſover*, &c. And will any ſay, ſhe ought therefore to have been Separated from. 5. On this ground of yours ye would ſeparate from all the Proteſtant Churches in the World at this day; in none of which ye will find a Lecture: Yea, ye would have ſeparate from the Church of *Scotland*, ever till about the year, 1645. for till then we had no Lectures. I could wiſh indeed all our Sermons were more like Lectures, as Lectures have been, and are by ſome uſed, that is, that Miniſters would take long Texts, and reduce them into ſome few points, eſpecially inſiſting on the Scope, as is uſual in Churches abroad, I make no doubt, people would pleaſe this way better, and retain more of what is ſpo-

ken, than when Miniſters confine themſelves to ſhort Texts, and then too oft rack both the Text, and their own Brains, ſeeking matter to hold out the time with. But herein I only give my own judgement.

D. *There is another thing yet keepeth me back from joining with you in your Aſſemblies for Divine worſhip: If I ſhould joyn with you, many good people would be offended, who look upon hearing among you to be a ſin: and the Apoſtle ſaith, we muſt not give offence, nor lay a ſtumbling block before others.*

I. When the word forbiddeth us to give offence; Firſt, it is meant of not doing that before others which is in it ſelf ſinful, whereby we indeed offend or grieve the godly, as alſo, lay a ſtumbling block in the way of others by our ill example: Now when you do your duty in obeying God, you cannot be ſaid to give offence unto any: And if any will be offended at you, it's their own ſin and weakneſs, for they take offence where none is given, and in the preſent caſe if any will be offended at you for your maintaining unity and peace

peace in the Church, and for not forſaking the aſſembling of your ſelf together with the reſt of his people; It's their own weakneſs while you give them no Offence at all, but on the contrary, by your good example is in a holy way provoking them to their duty with you: and if you ſhall ly by for fear of their offence, you ſhall both omit your own duty, and harden them in their ſin. 2. Ordinarily where the Apoſtle forbiddeth Chriſtians to give offence to others, he is ſhewing how they ought to uſe their Chriſtian liberty in things indifferent: That they muſt not uſe it to the offence of their weak brother; when either thereby he ſhall contrary to his conſcience be emboldened to ſin, 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. or yet ſhould be grieved with us becauſe he thinks we ſin in doing what he conceives we ſhould not, *Rom.* 14. *verſe.* 15. Yet you muſt know if the Command of Authority interpoſe, and injoyn me to uſe a thing in it ſelf indifferent, or not uſe it; then and in that caſe it's no more indifferent to me as to that particular and time, my liberty, *pro tunc*, is determined and reſtricted by

Authority; and the thing, though in it's own nature indifferent ſtill, is by the ſupervenient command of Authority made neceſſary to me in my uſing, or not uſing it, according as Authority hath determined, *Act.* 15. *verſ.* 28. *Theſe neceſſary things*. though ſome of theſe things were not neceſſary in themſelves, yet abſtaining from them was at that time made neceſſary by the Authority of that Council, for the good of the Church. Then and in ſuch a caſe as this, my obedience to Authority will preponderat the other of not giving offence, the firſt being the greater duty of the two, as *Divines* and *Caſuiſts* ſhew. And even in this caſe I give no offence, but do my duty, and if any take offence, it's cauſeleſs on my part, and is occaſioned through my brothers weakneſs. It is *Scandalum acceptum non datum*, Scandel groundleſly taken by him, not at all given by me. When the Apoſtle forbiddeth Chriſtians to uſe their liberty to the offence of the weak, he ſpeaketh to thoſe who were not determined by Authority. Have you any more to ſay for your Schiſm?

D. *You*

D. *You ſtill impute Schiſm to us.*

I. And in doing ſo I wrong you not, but am ſorry ye give me too juſt ground. either ye are *Schiſmaticks*, or the chriſtian Church never had any, ye have miſerably rent the bowels of the poor Church your mother. I pray the Lord diſcover to you this ſin, and give you repentance, ye both forſake the Church Aſſemblies, and alſo erect Separate meetings of your own, both in private houſes, and in the fields.

D. *What ill in ſo doing? did not Chriſt preach in private houſes and in the fields, and people hear in any place, and why may not we do the like?*

I. It's true, Chriſt preached in houſes, and in the fields, and people heard. But did he ſo upon ſuch grounds as ye do, to wit, that he might ſeparate and teach people to ſeparate from the *Jewiſh* Church: Or did he either think or teach that the *Jewiſh* teachers at that time ought not to be heard? I trow not. He was oft in the Temple, and in the Synagogues, he allowed of hearing of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, only with this *proviſo*, to beware of their lea-

ven and bad lives, ſome whom he miraculouſlie healed, he ſent to the Prieſts to offer their Offering according to the Law, and did not bid people decline or diſown them, for as corrupt as they were. But ye on the contrary erect meetings of your own, becauſe yethink ours unlawful to join with. But further, Chriſt preached in any place. 1. Becauſe he was about the bringing in of the Goſpel Doctrine into the World, and of Preaching himſelf the true *Meſſiah*, which was neceſſarie to be done, and therefore took all occaſions for doing it in anie place, and the rather, becauſe of the oppoſition this Doctrine, (though in it ſelf moſt neceſſarie) met with from the Jewiſh teachers. And 2. Chriſt was the head of the whole Church, and therefore was not to be limited in the waie and manner of his Miniſtrie, as other Teachers ought and muſt be, but might Preach, when, and where, and to whom he pleaſed, for all belonged to his Miniſtrie, and I know none in the World will ſay, that he is univerſal Paſtor of the whole Church, except the *Pope*: Nor will any ſay that

it

it is warrantable for meer men to do what Christ did in everie thing. These meetings of yours ye hold and frequent in despight of the Laws of the Land, which are verie expres against them. And so to Schism ye add disobedience to the Civil Powers.

D. *Should I be hindered by the Law of the Land from hearing the Word of God, and other parts of his Worship: Or Ministers hindred to preach. You know it's better to obey God than men.*

I. The Laws of the Land hinder not, but allow and command you to hear the Word of God in your own Congregations, where ye have the Gospel purelie preached by the allowance, and under the defence of Authoritie, a mercie ye too little value. Is it not better to Worship God in a way not contrarie to the Law of the Land, the Law allowing me to Worship him purelie, than in a waie that is contrarie to the Law, and joyned with disobedience to it. As for what you bring out of *Act.* 4. 19. From the Apostles their not obeying the Council of *Jerusalem*, discharging them to speak at all, or teach in the Name of Jesus,

it

it doth no waie quadrat with your caſe. For *Firſt*, The Apoſtles had an immediate extraordinarie call from Chriſt himſelf, to Preach in his Name, and ſo were not to be diſcharged by anie Power on Earth. 2. The Prohibition given to them was intended to ſuppreſs the Goſpel abſolutelie, and as ſuch, and therefore it was not lawful for them to obeie: Nor was there anie other viſible waie to propagate the Goſpel through the World, but by their Preaching. But among us, though ſome Miniſters be ſilent, there are manie others not diſcharged, but allowed to Preach. And, bleſt be God, the oppoſition of Authoritie is not againſt the Goſpel it ſelf, but againſt your diſorders.

D. *Can the King and the Laws ſilence a Miniſter that he may not preach the Word of God?*

I. You now give me occaſion to tell you brieflie how your Preachers behave themſelves in this Schiſm, who are indeed the great propagators of it. 1. They exerce their Miniſtrie contrarie to the Command of Authoritie; concerning which you ask, whether the King and the

the Law can ſilence a Miniſter, that he may not preach the Word of God. To which, I ſay, you read of *Solomons* thruſting out *Abiathar* from the Prieſt-hood, 1 *King.* 2. 27. That it was a depoſing of him ſimply from all Prieſtly power. I ſhall not debate, yet ſure it was a reſtraining of his Prieſtly power as to the actual exercing, and officiating, which he was bound to ſubmit to. This a King may do, he may inhibite a Miniſter to Preach in his Dominions, and the Miniſter ſo diſcharged, ought to be ſilent, and not counteract, even ſuppoſe he think, the King and the Law wrongs him, eſpecially when there are others to preach the Goſpel, though he, or ſundry be ſilent. May be you have heard what *Beza* ſaith to this caſe, *Epiſt.* 12. In anſwer to ſome in *England*, if in caſe the Queen (*Elizabeth*) and the Biſhops would either have Miniſters Preach on their Terms, or not at all; they might Preach, notwithſtanding of the Prohibition of Authority: To which he anſwereth, *Tertium enim illud nempe ut contra Regiæ-Majeſtatis & Epiſcoporum voluntatem Miniſterio ſuo fungantur*,

gantur, magis etiam exhorreſcimus, i. e. "As to the third, to wit, that Miniſters "exerciſe their Miniſtry contrary to the "will of the *Queen* and the Biſhops, is "a thing we yet more abhore. Next, Theſe who preach among you make themſelves Miniſters of the whole Church, without any fixt or ſettled charge.

D. *I have heard ſay that every Miniſter, is a Miniſter of the Catholick Church.*

I. That it is true, and that you may ſee in what ſenſe, and on what grounds we ſay ſo againſt *Independents*, read Mr. *Rutherfoord* in his due right of Preſbytrie, *pag.* 204. (though wrong figured) and he tells you, that though a Paſtor be Paſtor of the *Catholick* Church, yet he is not a *Catholick* Paſtor of the Catholick Church, as were the Apoſtles. And that by a Calling, or Ordination, he is made a Paſtor, but by Election is to be reſtricted to be ordinarily the Paſtor of his Flock: So Mr. *Durham* on *Rev. pag.* 106, 107. ſaith, *a Miniſter, though he be a Miniſter of the Catholick Church, yet is not a Catholick Mi-*

Miniſter of the Catholick Church, and that there is great odds betwixt theſe two. The Apoſtles, ſaith he, *were Catholick Miniſters of the Catholick Church, and ſuch the Pope claims to be, that is, to have an immediate acceſs for exerciſing his Office equally, and indifferently to all places. Miniſters*, ſaith he, actu primo, *have a commiſſion, and power to be Miniſters of the whole Church, and Watch-men of the whole* Citie *indefinitly: Yet*, actu ſecundo, *They are ſpecially delegated for ſuch and ſuch Congregations, and Poſts.* But Miniſters among you have made themſelves *actu ſecundo*, Miniſters of all the Congregations of the Countrey where they can come. And from this followeth a third ſtep, they incroach, and intrude upon the Charges of other men, of which, I ſpoke before, and now only ſhall queſtion you by what Authoritie they do ſo: What call have they to preach, and adminiſter the Sacraments to people of another Miniſters Charge, not being called, or deſired by the Miniſters of thoſe people, ſo to do? Their call is either ordinary or extraordinary. *Ordinary* they have none, never being called

led to be Miniſters of thoſe Congregations, nor ſo much as imployed by the Miniſter of the place, to exerciſe any Miniſterial act among his people. And for an *Extraordinary* call, I think they will not pretend to it. It may be ſeen by Acts of Councils in ancient times, how the Church hath guarded againſt this kind of incroaching by one upon anothers Charge: Otherwiſe what confuſions, and abſurdities would inevitably follow? When theſe Miniſters who went to *Aberdeen*, to perſwade the taking of the National Covenant, preached there without leave of the Miniſters of the place, the *Doctors* and *Miniſters* asked them, how it was, that without their conſent, and againſt their will, they publickly preached to the people of their Congregations? Which they tell them was a thing repugnant to Scripture, and to Canons of ancient Councils. I might further let you ſee by what practices miniſters among you advance this *Schiſm*. They are careful to ordain men of their own way, that hereby the Schiſm might be perpetuated, and kept on foot. They are much in inveighing

ing againſt *Biſhops* and *Curats* (as they call the Miniſters) Hereby to alienate the minds of people from their own Paſtors. Of late they have great mixt communions, at which, perſons ignorant of the common principles, and vitious perſons, may be, and I little doubt are admitted, it being hardly poſſible by their way, to keep them back. I might alſo ſpeak of their great diſſwaſives to people, not to hear their own Paſtors, and of their ſtrange, and dreadful uncharitableneſs to ſuch as differ from them, which ſin, they have with too much unhappie ſucceſs diffuſed among their ordinarie hearers. Mr. *Baxter* ſaith to this purpoſe, in the preface to his *Cure of Church diviſions*, *To Preach without love, and to hear without love, and to pray without love, to any that differ from your Sect: O what a loathſome Sacrifice is it to the God of Love? If we muſt leave our Gift at the Altar, till we are reconciled to an offended brother, what a gift is theirs, who are unreconciled to almoſt all the Churches of Chriſt, or to multitudes of their Brethren, becauſe they are not of their way: Yea, that make their Communion the very*

badge

badge and means of their uncharitableneſs, and diviſions.

D. I *cannot deny but there may be ſome truth in theſe things, I have heard from you. And now* I *muſt take my leave, and ſhall have my thoughts of what hath paſt betwixt us, now and then, when I am alone.*

I. Do ſo I pray you, and ſeek Illumination from God, and that he would remove prejudices, which too oft ſtand in the way of our embracing Truth. Only let me give you a few advices further before we part. And 1. Be not too confident of your own opinions, as if you were undoubtedly in the right, but conſider ſeriouſly what I have ſaid, to inform you at our three Conferences. 2. Think not that the matters in debate among us, are the very ſubſtantials of Religion, or that people may not be of different perſwaſions in theſe things, and yet both ſides maintain Love, and Church fellowſhip: for this were to run unto manifeſt ſin, and evil, *viz. Schiſm*, which is a renting of Chriſts body, the Church, and neglecting publick Ordinances, upon fears

fears of what is only diſputable, and ſuppoſed to be evil. There have been far greater differences among Chriſtians in former times, and yet Church-communion not broken. I might ſhew you that not only different opinions about Church Government, hath been no hinderance to keep Proteſtants from joyning together in the Worſhip of God, and other parts of Chriſtian Communion; but alſo when ſuch as differed from others in the manner of their performing Worſhip, have been occaſionally in one anothers Churches, they have without ſcruple conformed to the cuſtome of the Church, they were in for the time. I pray you conſider, if you Separate from the Church, becauſe of Biſhops, you ſhould on this ground have been a Separatiſt, in almoſt all ages, ſince Chriſtianity began: And if you think Epiſcopacy ſuch an error, and corruption, that none ought to hold communion, with a Church where it is; then you muſt think, Chriſt holds no Communion with ſuch a Church: and if ſo, then it will follow, that there have been ſundrie ages ſince Chriſts

time,

time, wherein he had no Church on Earth to keep communion with; Yea, that theſe thouſand ſix hundred years bygone, there hath been but rarely, and very ſeldom a true Church on Earth. And ſo what ſhould become of his Promiſes to his Church? that ſhe ſhould be built on the Rock, and againſt her the gates of Hell ſhould not prevail: and that he would be with her alway unto the end of the World, And alſo this were to make Chriſt a head without members, a King without a Kingdom, &c. Therefore, 3. Have charity for ſuch as differ from you in the time, and beware of either thinking, or ſaying, they have no grace, becauſe they are not of your way. The Apoſtle ſpends a whole Chapter in commending, and recommending charity to the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 13. *chap.* Among whom there were corruptions, and differences, in greater matters than among us, 1 *Cor. chap.* 11. and *chap.* 15. And remember, it's uſual with thoſe, who have leaſt truth on their ſide, to have leaſt charity too, *Rom. chap.* 14. Theſe weak Chriſtians

ans who underſtood not their liberty in being looſed from the Cerimonial Law, as they had leaſt truth on their ſide, in reſpect of the ſtrong, who knew their liberty; ſo had they leaſt charity, for, *verſ.* 3, 4. *They judged the ſtrong. Papiſts* will have no charity for *Proteſtants*, yet *Proteſtants*, who are in the right, dare not met back to them with that meaſure. 4. Conſider what hazard we bring our ſelves under, by our unchriſtian diviſions, *Gal.* 5. 15. *Mark* 3. 24. And what advantage we give to the common Enemy, not only to make us a mock, but alſo a prey. It was long ago obſerved by the Hiſtorian *Dum ſinguli pugnant, univerſi vincuntur.* i. e. While they fight among themſelves, they are all overcome. And the Story of *Scilurus*, injoining his Sons to maintain concord among themſelves, which he elegantly examplified by the Sheaf of Arrows, is known. 5. Acquaint your ſelf with the writings of the old non-conformiſts in *England*, *Cartwright*, *Bredſhaw*, *Ball*, *Paget*, *Hilderſham*, &c. Who wrote, and teſtified againſt the *Brouniſts*, and

ſuch

ſuch like *Separatiſts*, for their ſeparating from the Church of *England*, for which ſeparation, much more could have been pretended, than ye can for ſeparating from us: And you will ſee, how zealouſly, and by what good arguments theſe men battered down Separation. Alſo, Mr. *Baxter*, one of the preſent non-conformiſts in *England*, hath written a whole Book againſt Separation from that Church, which he calleth, the *Cure of Church diviſions*, where he giveth ſixtie directions to people, to guard them againſt the ſin of Separation, ſome of which, I ſhall but name, omiting his enlargements. The 6. is, That we make not our Terms of Communion with any Church ſtricter, than Chriſt hath done. 7. That we have deep and true apprehenſions of the neceſſitie and reaſons of Chriſtian unity, and concord, and of the ſin and miſery of diviſion, and diſcord; and conſider what the Scripture ſaith herein. 19. That we engage not our ſelves too far in any divided Sect, nor Spouſe the Intereſt of any party of Chriſtians, to the neglect and injury of the Univerſal

ſal Church, and the Chriſtian cauſe. 20. That we be very ſuſpicious of our religious paſſions, and carefully diſtinguiſh betwixt a ſound, and ſinful zeal; leſt we father our ſin on the Spirit of God. 25. That we be not overtender of our reputation, with any ſort of people on Earth, nor too impatient of their diſpleaſure, cenſures, or contempt, but live above them. 26. That we uſe not our ſelves needleſly to the familiar company of that ſort of Chriſtians, who uſe to cenſure them that are more ſober, catholick, and charitable, than themſelves, &c. Where he ſaith, if ever we ſhall have peace, and love recovered, it muſt be by training up young Chriſtians under the precepts, and examples of grave, judicious, and peaceable Guides. 31. That Chriſtians never begin too ſoon with doubtful opinions, nor ever lay too much weight upon them. 41. That the bare favour of a Preacher, nor the loudneſs of his voice, or affectionate utterance, draw us not to admire him without a proportion of ſolid underſtanding, and judiciouſneſs. 43. That we reject not a good

cauſe,

cauſe, becauſe, it may be owned by bad men, and own not a bad cauſe, for the goodneſs of the Patrons of it. 44. That we take the bad examples of Religious Perſons to be one of our moſt perilous temptations, and therefore learn to diſcover what are the ſpecial ſins of Profeſſors in the age, we leave in, that we may be fortified againſt them. 56. Keep ſtill in our eye the ſtate of all Chriſts Churches on Earth, that we may know, what a people they are through the World, whom he keeps communion with, and may not ignorantly ſeparate from almoſt all the Churches of Chriſt, while we think we ſeparate but from thoſe about us. 60. That we count it als comfortable to be a Martyre for love and peace, by blind Zealots as for the faith by Infidels, and Heathens. You may perceive that many of you have need of ſuch counſels as theſe. The old *Engliſh* non-conformiſts, though they did diſſent from the Ceremonies of that Church, and deſired a forbearance in thoſe things, as to their own practice, (which is not our caſe) yet fully declared againſt Separation, both by

by their Practice, and Writings; some of them have called it the bitter root of Separation, the way that God never blest with Peace and Holiness.

Some Passages out of the *English* Presbyterians, their *Jus Divinum Ministerij Anglicani*, anent the Unwarrantableness of Separation, I shall name briefly.

Pag. 10. *It's agreeable to the will of Christ and much tending to edification, that all those that live within the same bounds, should be under the care of the same Minister, or Ministers, to be taught by them, ... and to remove altogether these Parochial bounds, would open a gape to thousands to live like*

sheep without a shepherd, ----- *And in a little time would bring in all manner of profaneness and atheism.*

Pag. 11. *Object. What if a godly man live under a wicked or heretical Minister, Ought such a Man to hear such a Minister?* Ans. *In such a case that man ought rather to remove his habitation, than that for his sake, the bounding of Parishes be laid aside.*

Pag. 12. *In Scripture to appoint* Elders *in every Church, and in every* City *is all one. They that were converted in a* City *(who were at first but few in number) joyned in* Church-Fellowship *with the* Elders *and* Congregation *of that* City, *and not with any other.*

Pag. 25. *Some evil men may, and alwise have,* de facto, *been Officers and Ministers in the Church. In the* Jewish *Church* Hophni *and* Phineas: *In the days of Christ, Scribes and Pharisees, yet the wickedness of such did not null or evacuat their Ministerial Acts. The* Scribes *and Pharisees were to be heard, though they said, and did not. Christ's commission did as well authorize* Judas *as any other to preach and baptize*

baptize —— *The leproſie of the hand doth not hinder the growing of the Corn, which that hand ſoweth.*

Pag. 42, 43. *The ten Tribes did not only worſhip God after a falſe manner; by ſetting up their* Golden Calves *in* Dan *and* Bethel, &c. —— *Yet notwithſtanding all this when the Prophet came to anoint* Jehu, *he ſayeth, thus ſaith the Lord God of* Iſrael, *I have anointed thee King over the people of the Lord, even over* Iſrael, &c. *In Chriſts time, it is evident that the Office of the Prieſt, and high-prieſt was exceedingly corrupted, they came ordinarily unto their Office by bribery and faction* —— *The prieſts, and high-prieſts had the chief ſtroak in the crucifying of Chriſt. And yet we read,* Joh. 11. 51. Caiaphas *is owned by the holy Ghoſt, as high-prieſt,* &c. Act. 23. *When* Paul *ſaid to the high-prieſt, God will ſmite thee, thou whited wall,* &c. *And they that ſtood by ſaid, Revileſt thou the high-prieſt?* Paul *anſwered, I wiſt not, brethren, that he was the high-prieſt. For it is written, thou ſhalt not ſpeak evil of the Ruler of thy people.* Paul, *as many think, acknowledged him as high-*

priest, though the priest-hood at that time was Tyrannical, Heretical, and they came by most unjust ways into their places, and offices. From all this it appears, that corruptions cleaving to Gods Ordinances, do not null his Ordinances. Thus they.

Mr. Rutherfoord (a witness whom ye will not refuse) in his due-right of Presbytrie, from pag. 220. to pag. 256. (though wrong figured) discusseth the Question, in what cases it is lawful to separate from a Church, where among sundry other things, he saith, pag. 232. Separation from a true Church, where the Orthodox Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administred, we think unlawful: And at great length he vindicats, 2 Cor. 6. 14. against Separatists.

Pag. 233. The personal sins of others are no warrant for Separation: For Christ himself and the Apostles did eat the passover and worship God, with one, who Christ said had a devil, and should betray the Son of Man, and was an unclean man, Joh. 13. 11, 18. Ibid. If it be said, Judas was neither convicted of his treachery against Christ, nor was he known to the Apostles by name to be the man: For

some

ſome of them ſuſpected themſelves, and not Judas *to be the traitor.* Anſw. *Chriſt told the Diſciples that they were an unclean ſociety, and that one had a devil: And therefore though they knew not the man by name, who had the devil, yet they knew the ſociety to have a devil; and to be unclean for that one man's cauſe, yet Chriſt and the Diſciples did communicat at that Supper, notwithſtanding of this.*

Pag. 250. *It was not lawful to ſeparat from the Phariſees preaching the truth in* Moſes, *his Chair.*

Pag. 253. *The godly laudably did not ſeparate from the Iſrael and Church of God, becauſe the Altar of* Damaſcus *was ſet up, and becauſe of the high places. Things dedicated unto Idols, as* Lutheran *images, may be called, and are called,* 1 Cor. 10. 34. *Idolatry, yet are they Idolatry by participation, and ſo the cup of devils,* 1 Cor. 10. 21. Paul *doth not command Separation from the Church of* Corinth, *and the Table of the Lord there.*

Pag. 254. *The godly in* England *who refuſed the Ceremonies, and Biſhops, did well, not to ſeparate from the viſible Church*

in England. *He saith indeed they separated from the Church in the worst and greatest part: which he understands of their disowning Bishops and the Ceremonies, but yet they kept communion with that Church in unquestionable duties, as is well known, all except the Separatists, against whom, Mr.* Rutherfoord *is here reasoning, and against whom, the old Nonconformists did write.* Ibid. *If a Church be incorrigible in a wicked conversation, and yet retain the true faith of Christ, it is presumed, God hath there some to be saved, and that where Christs Ordinances be, there also his Church presence is: And therefore I doubt much if that Church should be separated from, for the case is not here as with one simple person, for it is clear, all are not involved in that incorrigible obstinacy, and that is yet a true visible communion in which we are to remain; for there is some Union with the Head Christ, where the faith is kept sound and that visibly. Though a private brother being scandalous and obstinatly flagitious, be to be cast off, yet are we not to deal so with an Orthodox Church, where the most part are scandalous.* Ibid. *I see not but we*

may

may Separate from the Lords Supper where Bread is adored, and from Baptism, where the sign of the Cross is added to Christs Ordinance, yet are we not Separated from the Church, for we professedly hear the Word, and visibly allow the truth of Doctrine, maintained by that Church, and are ready to seal it with our blood, &c.

Pag. 254, 255. *There may be causes of non-union with a Church, which are not sufficient causes of Separation.* Paul *would not separate from the Church of the Jews, though they rejected Christ, till they openly Blasphemed,* Act. 13. 44, 45, 46. Act. 18. 16.

Ibid. *There is no just cause to leave a less clean Church (if it be a true Church) and to go to a purer and cleaner: Though one who is a member of no Church, may joyn to that Church which he conceiveth to be purest, and cleanest. You see then that Mr.* Rutherfoord, *and the* English *Presbyterians, in their Book cited before, teach, that neither personal faults, whether in Ministers or People (suppose they be real) nor yet real faults about the Worship of God, are sufficient grounds*

of

of Separation ; much leſs when but only ſuppoſed.

Now to make an end, try all things impartially, and know that it is no diſparagement for you, nor any to retract that, wherein you have been wrong, either in opinion, or practice. It is indeed ſomewhat hard for men to confeſs they have been wrong, and ſuch are rare to be fouud: yet *Auguſtin* one of the moſt learned of all the Fathers, wrote whole Books of retractions, for which he is as deſervedly famous, as for any thing elſe. And, ſaith *Jerom* to *Ruffinus*, *never bluſh to change thy opinion, for neither you, nor I, nor any perſon alive, are of ſo great Authority as to be aſhamed to confeſs, we have erred.* The Lord bleſs us with Truth, and Peace, Peace be within the Walls of our *Jeruſalem*, and Proſperitie within her Palaces, and let them proſper who love her, and her peace. *Amen.*

D. *I thank you for your free, and friendly communing with me. I know the Apoſtle biddeth me* prove all things, *which I reſolve*

ſolve to do, And to begg illumination from the Father of Lights, and that he would give me underſtanding in all things. And what upon due tryal, I find to be right and good, I ſhall by his Grace hold it faſt. Farewel.

Schiſma proles ſuperbiæ, male perſeverando ſit Hæreſis, & mater Hæreſeos.

FINIS.

2 10
1 06
6
3 10

Differences of the Time.